

THE EXPOSITORY TIMES.

Notes of Recent Exposition.

THERE is a short article by Professor G. A. Johnston Ross in a recent number of the *Sunday School Times* on the danger of worshipping the angel.

The reference is, in the first place, to a confession, 'a naïve confession,' Professor Ross calls it, made by the author of the *Apocalypse*. Once, when lost in wonder at the discoveries granted to him of the mysteries of the spiritual world, he was betrayed into offering to the created medium of the discoveries that devotion which he ought to have reserved for God alone. 'I fell down to worship at the feet of the angel which shewed me these things. Then saith he unto me, See thou do it not; for I am thy fellow-servant, and of thy brethren the prophets, and of them which keep the sayings of this book: worship God.'

If we think of it, are we not somewhat shocked? How could the writer of the *Book of Revelation* appear even momentarily to falter in his monotheism? Professor Johnston Ross does not think it at all astonishing.

For in point of fact, he says, it never has been easy for men to reserve worship for God alone. 'We have come in process of time,' said a thoughtful Zulu, 'to worship spirits, because we knew not what to say about the great God who

is before all others, and so we could not bear to think of Him.' This is corroboration of St. Paul. 'They refused,' says the Apostle, 'to retain God in their knowledge, and so worshipped the creature rather than the Creator.' And even the Old Testament has been described as the story of a prolonged effort 'to keep Jehovah in His true place.'

But the point is, that we are very ready to worship the angel still. 'There is in the heart of men so profound a sense of the fitness to his need of certain words of God, that when they are uttered, the possession of them by the intermediary seems so wonderful as to compel an awe of the intermediary that may come dangerously near to worship.' Professor Ross thinks that there are good elements in this awe. There is gratitude, there is admiration, there is deep self-distrustful reverence. And who are the objects of this awe that is so closely and so dangerously near to worship? They are ministers of the gospel.

Ministers of the gospel, says Mr. Johnston Ross, who have found themselves the objects of this reverential awe have been compelled to recognize the beautiful elements in it. And precisely this has constituted their problem in dealing with it. For they have seen its deadly danger; how quickly, almost insensibly, the eyes of the

worshipper fall away from God, and fasten only on God's messenger; how the real force of the message is missed when the worshipper's heart finds itself comforted and pleased by the reflex soothing of its own admiration and recognition of the messenger; and, above all, 'what postponements of close grips with controversies of conscience,' may be made through the device of 'worshipping the angel.'

At the close of the session of the United Free Church College in Aberdeen, Principal IVERACH delivered an address on 'The Christian Message.' Reading the address, as reported in the *Aberdeen Free Press*, one can see that the moment Dr. IVERACH began to think of his immediate topic he had to face the fact that other religions claimed to have a message for men as well as Christianity. He went at once to the heart of the matter. Other religions *have* a message. But here lies the difference. The message of Christianity comes from God; other messages do not. And that difference is fundamental and final.

Can this claim be established? Is it only a vague claim on behalf of revelation, or the inspiration of the Bible? Is it a mere assertion of boastful superiority which cannot be put to any acknowledged test? No. There is a test; and it is bound to be recognized. It is, moreover, unanswerable. It is the fact that the Founder of Christianity was the Son of God.

The founder of Muhammadanism was not the Son of God. Nor was the founder of Buddhism. What Jesus said He said in the fulness of the Holy Spirit of God. What Jesus did He did as carrying out the purpose of God from all eternity. 'My Father worketh hitherto, and I work.'

But how can this claim, that what Jesus said and did was what God says and does be upheld? Time will uphold it. Wait and see. Other religions have already been proved unable

to keep step with the progress of knowledge, and the enlightenment of the conscience. Already Muhammadanism has fallen behind. But until now Christianity has led the march of civilization, and to-day holds an ideal of conduct before the face of man of which the complaint is, not that it is too low, but that it is too high to be attainable. That is one way of proving the Sonship of Jesus.

The other way is to look back. Has not Jesus Christ actually made revelations, and are they not the fundamental things, the very bread and wine of the higher life? Who gave the world the conception of the unity of the human race? You applaud the Roman poet's 'Nihil humanum a me alienum puto,' but what do you say to One who calls Himself by the very title of Son of man? Calls Himself? Here is the difference, that as a sentential exclamation, or even as an adopted name, one might attain to it anywhere, but Jesus lived as the Son of man. For the first and last time in history He was without partiality and without preference.

And who taught the Fatherhood of God? What a thought it is! The mere fringe of the garment of it is all that we are able to touch yet. Did we receive it from Plato? Did Seneca pass it on to us? As for the great founders of religion, the thought of God's Fatherhood is not once to be entertained in their presence. And again, it was not a thought merely. It was a life. He had a Father, God; He lived and loved as a Son of God.

And once more, who delivered men from the fear of death? What a tyrant death was in the Greek and Roman world. What a tyrant it is still in the world that is not Christian. And how did Jesus of Nazareth deliver from the fear of death? Most extraordinary surely of all the religious things ever transacted on this earth—by submitting to death.

Thus the Christian message is Christ—Christ the standard of life, Christ the assurance of love,

Christ the hope of glory. 'Apart from Christianity,' says Principal IVERACH, 'there is something absurd and almost grotesque in man.' The sentence will not soon be forgotten. And it is because Christianity is Christ.

'The eschatological question is, without doubt, the most live issue in New Testament criticism at the present day.' It has come to that through a variety of fortunate circumstances. Abbé Loisy began the interest. Protestants are always ready to regard with indulgence the man whose books are placed on the Index. Father TYRRELL continued and deepened it. 'When we read George Tyrrell,' says Professor MOULTON, 'we make tacit allowance as Protestants for the pessimism which colours the noble utterance of the lonely thinker who was cast out by his own unworthy Church, and yet loved her lost ideal too well to come over to us, his true spiritual brethren.' And it came to an acute stage of excitement when SCHWEITZER issued his book, *From Reimarus to Wrede*, and had it translated into brilliant English by Mr. MONTGOMERY, under the title of *The Quest of the Historical Jesus*.

What is the eschatological question? The best account of it is to be found in a volume of essays which has been issued by Messrs. T. & T. Clark, under the title of *The Eschatological Question in the Gospels* (6s. net). Loisy is here, George TYRRELL also; and SCHWEITZER most of all. And these authors are permitted to speak for themselves so unrestrainedly that we are compelled to see that no injustice is done to them by the fire of criticism through which they pass, though that criticism is keen enough to mark a distinct step forward in the discussion of the subject. The author of the volume is the Rev. Cyril W. EMMET, M.A., Vicar of West Hendred.

But there is also an account of the eschatological question in the *Free Church Year-Book and Who's Who* for 1911 (Meyer: Memorial Hall; 2s. 6d.

net). For it is a question that cannot be ignored by any Council or Congress. And at the meetings of the Sixteenth National Council of the Evangelical Free Churches an afternoon was set apart for its discussion, the subject being introduced by Professor James Hope MOULTON.

Professor MOULTON's account is short. It is too short for any but the already initiated. Others must go to Mr. EMMET. But surely it was listened to with attention. For not only does Dr. MOULTON, an evangelical of the evangelicals, grant the central demand of SCHWEITZER and the advanced eschatologists, but he even shows how momentous and how urgent are the issues that then wait the consideration of the Church of Christ.

The central demand of the eschatologists is that our Lord expected the end of the world within a very short space of time. And, of course, if He did so, He was mistaken. Dr. MOULTON will admit that He was mistaken. The possibility of mistake, and the fact of it—both were due to His self-limitation. He agreed to a condition in which He might, in which He actually did, make a serious miscalculation regarding the end of the world.

Professor MOULTON is not afraid to say so. He bids us not be afraid. 'Does the indefinite postponement of the Day of the Lord, for the hastening of which Jesus flung His life away, shatter the credit of Him of whom every new age tells more clearly that He has words of eternal life? We need not be afraid. After all, the foreshortening of history which made Him see that vivid future so near was only the inevitable condition of the real humanity which He took upon Him.' And Dr. MOULTON points out that in announcing His own ignorance, our Lord, 'in a saying of uniquely acknowledged authenticity,' claims for Himself, in all His human self-limitation, a dignity higher than men and angels: 'But of that day or that hour knoweth no one, not even the angels in heaven, neither the Son, but the Father' (Mk 13³²).

And if it was a mistake, it was a blessed one. Dr. MOULTON wonders if the world would have heard the gospel of the grace of God if Christ and the early disciples of Christ had not believed that the end of all things was at hand. He is not sure if the gospel would not have perished, strangled in its cradle, as it were, by the strong forces of the world that were arrayed against it, if it had not been that the preachers of the gospel believed that within their own generation the world and all the forces it commanded would be destroyed. 'Did not the Church's illusion,' he asks, 'justify by results the providence that allowed it? The tremendous sense of urgency that impressed itself upon the early Church, proved ultimately the one cause of the triumph of the Faith.'

Well, the world did not come to an end in that generation. It has not come to an end yet. And what now? Now, says Professor MOULTON, the danger is that the Church will think the world is not coming to an end at all, and so settle down to the determination to make as good a world out of it as can be made.

The words startle us. Is that not what we have to do? It is certainly what we are doing. Dr. MOULTON knows it is what we are doing. 'We are all of us immensely eager about social reform; and we are convinced that when we have established a more equitable social order, and made sweating and overcrowding, unemployment and drink, things of the past, there will be a good solid foundation on which the New Jerusalem may descend.' But he does not believe that that is what we have to do.

Our Christian vocabulary still proclaims that we are strangers and sojourners in a world that is passing away. Dr. MOULTON believes that our vocabulary is accurate. We make our Sunday-school children sing hymns which express yearning to quit this world for a better land. Dr. MOULTON believes that we ought to join our children in

singing them. If we are no longer trying to pull the heathen out of hell-fire; if we are trying to give them instead the blessings of Christian love for this world—well, Dr. MOULTON thanks God for that. But he warns us all, lest, in the very moment we thank God for that, we accept the Earth as our abiding city and unconsciously assimilate ourselves to the world around us.

Does Professor MOULTON not believe in progress? Surely. He is certainly a most progressive theologian. What he does not believe in is Progress (with a capital), which is an object and end in itself. He does not believe in that Progress which is a sort of personified worldliness, and of which the driving power is the motto: 'The greatest comfort of the greatest number.' This Progress has its enthusiasms. But there is one enthusiasm wanting to it, and by that want it is condemned. It has no Foreign Missionary enthusiasm.

If the secular reforming enthusiast ever conceives the idea of blessing other nations, it hardly goes further, says Dr. MOULTON, than a conviction that magic powers of millennial bliss reside in the importation of the British Flag, or else in the immediate granting of self-government, 'according to the shade of his politics.' And Dr. MOULTON does not believe that progress, whether in administration abroad or in science and industry at home, will ever accomplish even the end which the secular reformer sets before him, the greatest happiness of the greatest number. 'The denizens of Ancoats and Rotherhithe can now exchange visits by aeroplane, but the interesting possibility makes small difference to the dismal conditions of their lives. Motors are a glorious invention, but the village child gets nothing from them except the ruin of his only playground. Even the beneficent triumphs of medicine and surgery need to be qualified by the remembrance of the suffering and hardship to which the healed patient returns from the peace and luxury of the hospital. Nor is our question limited to the condition of the

poor. The rich themselves, who can use to the full the new resources of civilization, have gained little in that which makes for their lasting happiness. They may be flying down a country road on a Sunday morning instead of declaring themselves miserable sinners in church, but the improvement is equivocal after all.'

Professor MOULTON believes in progress. But it is progress that is subordinate to a higher law. If progress is to be along the lines of making this world a better place to live in—that and nothing more—he fears that the end of the world will come, as even the astronomers warn us, long before the ape and the tiger have died in man, and Borgias and Leopolds have ceased to flourish. He believes in progress, and he has worked for it, but he cannot acquiesce in the materialistic conviction that this present world only needs mending to make it the ideal home for righteousness to dwell in. He believes that it is our duty to look forward not to mending but to ending.

'I venture to think, therefore, that by the help of a "blasphemous book" (this is the epithet which Dean INGE has applied to SCHWEITZER'S book), by an argument which seems to strike at our most cherished convictions about Him after whose name we dare to call ourselves (he means the

argument based on our Lord's ignorance of 'that day and that hour'), we are being called to a reassertion of the Catholic Christology, and of the Christian hope which has lived before the saints of every age.'

The Catholic Christology is that Jesus of Nazareth (who 'knew not') was Very God; and that His death was not merely the most wonderful and pathetic of martyrdoms, but the climax of an obedience which made atonement for the sin of the whole world. And the Christian hope is to see the King in His beauty and to behold the land of far distances.

'We need to be other-worldly, heavenly-minded, our treasure laid up in the place where no moth or rust doth consume, and no demon of disillusionment breaks in to steal our life's hope.' And we need not fear, he says, that other-worldliness will make us less eager for the mending of this world. 'We fight against fleshly lusts because they "war against the soul." We strive to destroy sweating and swilling, because such environments make it fearfully difficult for a human spirit to be made ready for service in the realm of light. We preach the gospel to the heathen because it will give them a mighty uplift towards that holiness without which none shall see the Lord.'

The Authorized Version of the Bible.

By THE REV. S. R. DRIVER, D.D., REGIUS PROFESSOR OF HEBREW IN THE UNIVERSITY OF OXFORD.¹

'For the earth shall be full of the knowledge of the Lord, as the waters cover the sea.'—Is. xi. 9.

OUR country is commemorating this year the 300th anniversary of the publication of the Authorized Version of the Bible. This event was a momentous one in the history of the English people; and I should like this morning to place before you some thoughts suggested by it—to speak of the

long and sometimes troubled years of preparation and development which preceded it, of the influence which the version has exerted upon our people, and of the position which it holds at the present day. Let me describe to you briefly how the Authorized Version came into being.

In olden days both Bibles and service-books were in Latin; there was a prejudice against change; and it was a long and gradual process to get them translated into the language of the

¹ A sermon preached in the Cathedral Church of Christ, Oxford, on the Fourth Sunday in Lent (March 26), 1911.

people. As early, however, as the ninth and tenth centuries Anglo-Saxon versions of the Psalms, Gospels, and some of the historical books of the Old Testament were made. But no attempt was made to translate the entire Bible into English till the fourteenth century, in the reign of Edward III. (1327-1377), when John Wycliffe arose (1320-1384). Wycliffe was closely connected with Oxford. He was Steward of Merton College, Master of Balliol, and Warden of Canterbury College—a hostel for the reception of theological students from Canterbury—afterwards absorbed into Christ Church, where the Canterbury Quadrangle still marks its ancient site. Wycliffe was a man of remarkable ability and influence, an effective orator, and an unsparing assailant of the ecclesiastical and social abuses of his time. His life was a rebellion against what he conceived to be unjust dominion. The Bible, he felt, supported him in his contention; and so, with the help of Nicholas of Hereford, its translation was accomplished (1382). The translation was made, not from the original texts, but from the Latin Vulgate. Its reception showed that it met a need of the times. 'The new version,' we are told, 'was eagerly sought after and read. Copies passed into the hands of all classes of the people. Active and powerful measures were taken to suppress it; copies were sought for and burnt as most noxious productions of heretical depravity; but the number (150) of MSS which survived this inquisition and still remain testify what a large number there must have originally been.' Nevertheless Wycliffe's translation continued to be viewed with suspicion, and in 1408 the reading of it was expressly forbidden by Henry IV. (1399-1413).

During the century which elapsed between 1388¹ and the age of William Tindale nothing further was done for the translation of the Bible. Tindale was the real father of the Authorized Version. He was a native of Gloucestershire, who came to Oxford and became a student of Magdalen Hall, the old Grammar School, a portion of which is still to be seen just at the entrance to Magdalen College. He took his degree in 1512, shortly after the accession of Henry VIII. Since Wycliffe's death great events had happened and greater events were looming in the future, all of which materially helped the translation of the Bible into English. The age of the renaissance was begin-

ning. The capture of Constantinople in 1453 by the Turks caused many Greek scholars, carrying with them the treasures of their literature, to seek a home in the West, especially in Italy, and so brought about a revival of Greek learning in Europe. Greece, it has been strikingly said, thus 'rose from the grave with the New Testament in her hand'; and, as soon appeared, the Teutonic nations welcomed the gift. In 1477 the newly invented art of printing was introduced into England. In 1491 Greek was first taught in Oxford by William Grocyn, a Fellow of New College, who had studied in Italy. Colet and Erasmus, both men of the new learning, saw its value for the cause of reform. The former, as Dean of St Paul's Cathedral, preached against the worldliness of the clergy. The latter taught Greek at Cambridge from 1509 to 1514, and in 1516 published an edition of the New Testament in Greek, the first printed edition published in Europe. It at once made a great impression, and was much talked about. Between 1477 and 1530 many editions of the Hebrew Old Testament and the Greek New Testament were printed on the Continent, and found their way into England. A desire to possess the Bible in the vernacular sprang up throughout Europe, and many translations followed. In Germany Luther was beginning his crusade against Rome. He published the New Testament in German in 1522, and the whole Bible in 1534. Tindale was a reformer from his youth. In conversation with a learned divine, who said, 'We were better without God's laws than the Pope's,' he replied, 'I defy the Pope and all his laws. If God spares my life, ere many years I will cause a boy that driveth the plough to know more of the Scripture than thou doest.' He went to London, and sought to interest Tunstall, the Bishop of London at the time, in his plan of a translation, but soon discovered this to be impossible; as he mournfully said, he found that 'there was no room in my lord of London's palace to translate the New Testament, but also that there was no place to do it in all England.' He therefore left England and settled in Cologne. There he translated the New Testament into English; and, supplied with funds by English merchants, who promised to convey the work secretly to England, and diffuse it widely in that country, began to print it. But he was betrayed; the printing was interrupted; and he fled up the

¹ The date of Purvey's revision of Wycliffe's translation.

Rhine to Worms. Worms was devoted to Luther, and Tindale could work there in safety. He completed his translation, and 6000 copies reached England in 1526.

The English bishops met to deliberate on the situation ; and at once took active measures to suppress the book. All copies found were ordered to be burnt. The Bishop of London preached a sermon at St. Paul's Cross, in the precincts of the Cathedral, which was followed by a formal public burning of the dreaded book. Nevertheless the book was widely read in secret ; and among the places deeply infected with the new heresy was Cardinal College, the magnificent foundation of Wolsey, afterwards re-founded by Henry viii. as Christ Church. A memorable scene was enacted in St. Frideswide's Church, the present Cathedral, on February 21st, 1528. The Commissary, sent down by Wolsey to search out the heretics, entered the choir in the middle of evensong, interrupted the service, and conferred with the Dean in his seat respecting their arrest. We possess a graphic description, written by one of the suspects, a student of Alban Hall, of what subsequently happened.¹ Tindale meanwhile completed the Pentateuch in English, and it was printed at Marburg in 1530. After this he moved to Antwerp, and worked at other books of the Old Testament. In the end he was betrayed to his enemies, imprisoned in the Castle of Vilvorde, near Brussels, where, on October 6th, 1536, he was strangled and burnt. His last words were, 'Lord, open the King of England's eyes,' a prayer which before long was signally answered.

It is remarkable now how the secular arm came to the help of the English Bible. Henry viii., who was still on the Throne, had been unfriendly to Tindale, and had issued proclamations against the use of his translation. But the breach with Rome was beginning, and the situation changed quickly. In 1529 Wolsey fell from power ; in 1531 Henry assumed the title of supreme head of the Church of England ; in 1533 he divorced Catherine of Aragon and married Anne Boleyn, both with the strong disapproval of the Pope. Other points of difference arose ; and in the same year the papal authority in England was formally annulled. Feeling had also changed on the subject of Bible

¹ Fox, *Acts and Monuments of Martyrs*, ed. 1684, ii. 438-441 (the story of Dalaber and Garret) ; cf. Westcott, p. 40 ff.

translation. Shortly after Wolsey's death Henry had promised a translation of the Scriptures. Miles Coverdale, who certainly knew Tindale, and had not improbably assisted him, had been invited by Cromwell, who succeeded Wolsey in the King's favour (1529-1540), to make a translation of the entire Bible ; and in 1535 his translation appeared, dedicated to the King. This was the first English translation of the entire Bible.

But a more important version was one which appeared four years afterwards, in 1539, called from its size—it is a large and thick black-letter folio—the Great Bible. This also was Coverdale's work ; in fact, it was his earlier translation revised and improved, at the suggestion of Cromwell, by a more careful comparison of the original texts. It met with great success. A royal injunction commanded its free exhibition in all churches, and contemporaries tell us what interest it immediately evoked, how numbers flocked to the churches to read it, while as many as could procure it for themselves. In two years it went through seven editions, each with revision, and it was often reprinted afterwards. One part of the Great Bible is familiar to us still. When the Prayer Book was first compiled, in 1549, the Psalter was taken naturally from the Great Bible, and it remains there still, a monument of the noble and melodious English prose of which Coverdale was an acknowledged master.

The circulation of the English Bible remained unimpeded during the short reign of Edward vi. (1547-1553). With the accession of Mary (1553-1558) a change came. Rome was again in the ascendant, and the reformers had to flee to the Continent. A band of them settled in Geneva, the home of Calvin ; and there, in 1560, they produced another version, dedicated to Queen Elizabeth, and known as the Geneva Bible. This translation contained short explanatory notes. Its convenient size and useful notes caused it speedily to become the household Bible of Englishmen ; and it continued to be so for nearly a century. Some of the notes were, however, tinged with Calvinism ; so in 1568, also under Elizabeth, the Bishops' Bible appeared, so called from the number of bishops who assisted in its production.

But the existence of two rival translations was an inconvenience ; and soon after James i. came to the Throne he expressed the wish that the best scholars of the time should be invited to co-operate

and produce 'one uniform translation.' His wish was speedily carried out. The Bible was divided into six parts; six companies of scholars were appointed, two sitting at Westminster, two at Cambridge, and two at Oxford, to carry out the work. Rules were drawn up for their guidance; and the completed Bible, our Authorized Version, appeared in 1611.

Such, then, told briefly and imperfectly, is the long and sometimes tragic story of the progress by which an open Bible was secured for England. It is well that we, who enjoy in ease what our forefathers toiled and even gave their lives for, should remember the price at which our freedom was purchased, and feel the gratitude that is due to those who gave it to us. It is worthy of notice how all the crucial steps in the movement came from the party of reform. If the ecclesiastical authorities had retained their power, and had their will, there would have been no open Bible in England even to-day. The truth was obscured; abuses were rife; but the Bible, it was felt by those who knew it, was the charter of spirituality, of justice, and of freedom. To those who gave it to us in our own language we owe an incalculable debt.

The version of 1611 was not a new translation. It was founded upon the versions of Tindale and Coverdale, upon the Great Bible, the Geneva Bible, and the Bishops' Bible. King James' translators took from these the best that each could give, and welded all together, naturally with many corrections and improvements of their own, into a new whole. It was the final issue of nearly a century of preparation.

Its outstanding characteristic feature is the marvellous felicity of its style; a comparison of its renderings with those of the previous versions quickly makes its superiority in this respect apparent. The translators had all lived through the Elizabethan era. Shakespeare was still bringing out his plays while the translators were at their work. At least the leading spirits in all the companies showed themselves masters of a style which was chaste, dignified, and impressive, and of a rhythm which is always melodious and grateful to the ear. Style and rhythm are indeed externals; but they are externals which cannot be despised: they delight the ear, and so the thoughts which they enshrine find their way into the heart. The English Bible has all the attributes of a classic: it is a 'well of English undefiled.' The beauty, and

freshness, and innate attractiveness, which are the predominant characteristics of the original, combine, with this remarkable felicity of phrase and rhythm in the translation, to give the Authorized Version that incomparable fascination and influence which it has exerted over so many generations of Englishmen.

King James' translation has accomplished a great work—greater, we may be sure, than the translators themselves could in the least imagine or foresee. Though it did not at once supersede the Geneva and the Bishops' Bibles, in the end its superior merits won it its due, and it became the only Bible of the English-speaking people. Since the seventeenth century the Anglo-Saxon race has spread, and colonized regions of the earth of which our forefathers had never heard; and so King James' Bible has carried the light of truth, not only throughout our own islands, but into every part of the habitable world—into India, Africa, Australia, and into the teeming populations ever increasing, and ever pulsating with new energies and new life, which already occupy the greater part of the vast continent of Northern America, and are likely soon, in Canada, to be diffused yet more widely.

Let me quote here a few sentences which must voice, I am sure, the common feeling of Englishmen, from the admirable address presented to King George by the very representative deputation which waited upon him a few days ago: 'On the occasion of the Tercentenary of the issue of the Authorized Version of the English Bible, we, who believe the Bible to be "the most valuable thing that this world affords," desire to unite with your Majesty in thanksgiving to Almighty God for the inestimable blessings bestowed upon the English-speaking people by its translation into our mother-tongue, and its influence in the moulding of our national life. These blessings are enjoyed, not only in these islands and your Majesty's Dominions across the seas, but also in the United States of America, and wherever the English language prevails.' And then, after some remarks on our indebtedness to those who laboured and suffered—some of them laying down their lives—to secure for their fellow-countrymen, not only a version of the Holy Scriptures which they could understand, but also liberty to read it in their own homes, and upon the manner in which in the past the Throne had been linked with the work, the address con-

tinues: 'The growth and strength of the Empire owe much to the English Bible. It has sweetened home life; it has set a standard of pure speech; it has permeated literature and art; it has helped to remove social wrongs, and to ameliorate conditions of labour; it has modified the laws of the realm, and shaped the national character; and it has fostered international comity and goodwill among men. Above all, the English Version of the Bible has made accessible to us the revelation of God our Father in His Son Jesus Christ our Lord. . . . We praise God, not only for the benefits of the Bible to past generations, but also because its truths, as long as they are made the standard of life, will preserve the glory of our Empire through generations to come. . . . And we pray that your Majesty's subjects may continue to read this book until its spirit and teaching are vitalized in personal character and in domestic relationships, and so enter into every sphere of corporate life—business and professional, social and political, national and Imperial.' And our gracious Sovereign, in the course of his reply, said: 'This glorious and memorable achievement, coming like a broad light in darkness, gave freely to the whole English-speaking people the right and the power to search for themselves for the truths and consolations of our faith; and during 300 years the multiplying millions of the English-speaking races, spreading ever more widely over the surface of the globe, have turned in their need to the grand simplicity of the Authorized Version, and have drawn upon its inexhaustible springs of wisdom, courage, and joy.' These words, both those in the address and those in the reply from the Throne, we may unreservedly appropriate. In broad and general terms they describe truly the wonderful and far-reaching influence which the Authorized Version has exerted upon English-speaking people.

Perhaps one further point might be mentioned. For more than 100 years, since 1804, the British and Foreign Bible Society has been busily engaged in circulating in different languages copies of the Scriptures. The number of copies of the English Bible which it has circulated is incalculable; but besides this it circulates now either the Bible, or parts of the Bible, in some 400 other languages. I think we may ascribe this to at least the indirect influence of the Authorized Version, the value and the influence of a version in the vernacular, as tested by our own Bible, naturally suggesting and

encouraging the use of the same method when Christianity was offered to those nations of the earth who did not know it.

But while we admire and revere, we must not idolize. It is a mistake to make even a Version of the Bible into a fetish. It is 300 years since our Bible was translated; and it is the simple truth that it is not adequate to either the scholarship or the needs of the present day. There are two main reasons why the version of 1611 is not adequate now—both, it is right to say, due to the operation of causes which the translators themselves could neither prevent nor foresee. In the first place, the English language has itself changed since 1611; and many words and expressions which were perfectly clear then are obscure now. Some words, then in current use, are now obsolete, and their meanings, to all ordinary readers, are unknown; and other words have changed their meaning so that they mislead the modern reader. A reader of Shakespeare constantly comes across passages which he cannot understand for the same reason, and he must refer to a glossary for explanations. The case is the same with the Authorized Version. Archaisms, so long as they continue intelligible (as 'which' for 'who'), lend a choice, antique colour to the translation, which we are only too glad to retain; when they convey either no meaning, or a false meaning, as Bishop Lightfoot said long ago,¹ the time for removing them has come. To take a simple example, we are no longer justified in saying 'I know nothing by myself' when we mean 'I know nothing against myself.' Secondly, the Authorized Version is inadequate now on account of the progress of knowledge. King James' translators were learned men, fully abreast of the knowledge of their own day; through no fault of their own, they were not abreast of the knowledge of the present day. The languages of the original, both Hebrew and Greek, are much better understood now than they were in 1611; many of the ablest minds have given their best to the elucidation of the Bible; discovery and research in the East have thrown light upon much which, even fifty years ago, was obscure; so that now there is no book of the Bible which is not in some parts—in some cases in many parts—better understood than was the case 300 years ago. Of course, there are large parts of the Bible, including

¹ In his most valuable essay *On a Fresh Revision of the English N.T.* (1871, 2nd ed. 1872), p. 171.

a great number of theologically important texts, which would not be affected at all by a retranslation. But the Bible is not a collection of isolated texts; it consists largely of poems, prophetical discourses, and epistles, each, or each part, of which forms a continuous whole or consecutive argument, and can only be understood as such; and it is in these that the Authorized Version often fails to make the sense or the argument clear.

The Revised Version is no doubt capable of improvement; but we know how much superior it is to the Authorized Version in many difficult passages of both Testaments. We sometimes hear it said that the Bible is not read as much as it ought to be; but may not this be due, at least in part, to the fact that parts of it, including some which ought to be the most attractive, have not been made as clear and intelligible as they should be? It is the duty of the Church of the present day to utilize this new knowledge of which I have spoken for the purpose of giving its children a Bible as clear, and accurate, and intelligible, as possible. From the terms in which King James' translators speak in their preface to the readers,

we may be sure that, could they come to life again, they would be the first to do this themselves. A national Bible ought to be as accurate a Bible, and as intelligible a Bible, as the scholarship of the day can make it. And it ought to combine these qualities of accuracy and intelligibility with that dignity of style, felicity of phrase, and melodious rhythm, which are so conspicuous in the Authorized Version, without which a Bible would not deserve to be a national Bible, and without which it would cease to be the classic that such a Bible ought to be. To preserve all that is most beautiful in the Authorized Version, and all that is most characteristic of it, while altering that which time has shown to need correction or improvement, is not to disparage or dishonour the version which we all love; it is rather, by fitting it for longer life, to raise it to higher honour, and to adapt it for wider and deeper influence.¹

¹ For detailed particulars of the history of the English Bible, with comparisons of versions, etc., see Westcott, *History of the English Bible*, 2nd ed., 1905; W. F. Moulton, *History of the English Bible*, 2nd ed., 1911; and Lupton, in *D.B.*, v. 236-271.

In the Study.

The Beauty of the Lord.

WALKING in the garden of the Bible, I looked for something that would help us to delight in the Lord. Somehow I was hard to please. Sometimes we know not what we want till we actually see it.

'Come with me,' said the oldest of the gardeners. I went with him, but I feared his taste and style would be too old-fashioned for us. He took me away down an avenue of cypress trees, so still and solemn that my heart sank. 'Just as I feared,' I said, 'he has no idea that it is brightness I need for the Father's children.' But all at once we came out into sunshine and a delicious air, with birds singing and bees humming, and the old man's rugged face beamed as he stopped before the most charming bed of song-prayer you ever set eyes on. 'The very thing I want,' I cried, 'but however do you grow such beauty?' He rubbed his hands gleefully, and said he stuck the first cuttings of it in wilderness sand ages ago,

and it was always improving. It kept blooming all the year, and there was not a better family flower in the place.

Might I get some of it? Yes, and welcome, and both for young and old, and if we would help one another to look after it, the plant would fill our rooms with the most delicate perfume, and supply the finest of bouquets for the table, and as for buttonholes for lad or lass there was nothing to compare with a spray of it.

What did he call it? Beauty of the Lord, he said. The cypress avenue was the ninetieth Psalm, the Prayer of Moses the Man of God, and here at the sunny end of it was this bed of song-prayer—'Shew thy work unto thy servants, and thy glory unto their children, and let the beauty of the Lord our God be upon us.' Beauty of the Lord, that was the name; beauty from the Lord's beauty to beautify folks who have little enough of their own; beauty from the Lord's beauty for His boys and His girls.

'But what do you mean? People speak of you, as a man who cares only about the majesty of the Lord and His holy law. Now you speak of His beauty. I could even find people, sir, who know ever so much more than you do, but one thing they do not know. They do not know of the Lord being beautiful. Please tell me how you came to know of His beauty and of its being meant for the like of us.'

He lifted his eyes and gazed serenely on heaven and on earth, and I knew his thought. Is there not beauty in the skies, sunlit and moonlit and starlit? Is not earth crammed with endless beauty? Who thought it all out? Who thinks upon it all to keep the whole rich supply ever reproduced, every variety after its own kind?

A wonderful light had kindled in the eyes of Moses. His spirit was rejoicing within him, and as one in the rapture of a vision his soul spoke into mine—'In the beginning God created the heaven and the earth. And God saw everything that he had made, and, behold, it was very good.' Yea, surely, He who adorns all His work with beauty would have us assured that His own Spirit loves beauty, and desires to bestow the best of beauty on us whom He has made capable of sharing His love.

But a first answer is only a foundation. The fair face of nature is only one mirror of the beauty of the Lord. The heart of man craves a home. Moses went on to tell me how the Lord, who is Himself our dwelling-place in all generations, bade him make in the midst of Israel a house of God, and after a heavenly pattern, and of the richest materials, and of the finest workmanship. It was made for glory and for beauty. A holy house, it was also the House Beautiful, made to have a charm for the Lord's family, made to set their thoughts inquiring after the beauty of the Lord Himself.

He told me also of a mystic vision that he and Aaron and seventy of the elders once had on the Mount, whether in the body or out of the body he could not tell, only they found themselves in the presence-chamber of the Lord, and 'They saw the God of Israel, and there was under his feet as it were a paved work of sapphire stone, and as it were the very heaven for clearness. And upon the nobles of Israel he laid not his hand, also they saw God, and did eat and drink.' Plainly the impression left upon them was just an impression

of the beauty of the Lord, the beauty of His gentleness, the beauty of His hospitality.

Then the memory awoke in me of how when Moses was born, he was a goodly child. Good reason had he to think well of beauty. It was to beauty he owed his life. When God would raise up a deliverer for Israel, He began with giving a special touch of beauty to the face and eyes through which a baby soul looked out on his mother, and that was the charm that inspired her soul to the superlative degree of love that defied the decree of Pharaoh. By a touch of baby-beauty God confounded the things that were mighty.

Under the blazing sun of the desert and its sand-laden winds the face of Moses had long lost the beauty of youth. But what an indwelling beauty of spirit he showed when the Israelites degraded themselves to the worship of the golden calf, and the Lord proposed to him that they be destroyed, and he himself be made the father of a better-chosen people. What a prize for an ambitious man to grasp at, for a religious man to glory in! But not for a moment would Moses hear of such a thing, but he threw himself into the breach to make atonement for their sin, and to shield them, and plead for them, and persevere for them until his whole soul cried out, 'Oh, this people have sinned a great sin, and have made them gods of gold; yet now, if thou wilt forgive their sin—; and if not, blot me, I pray thee, out of the book which thou hast written.' That was beauty—the beauty of a heart utterly unselfish and heroic in its devotion to the people the Lord had entrusted him with. Not from Moses do we learn to restrain prayer, or to cast off the burden of love and be content if self be saved. Moses showed us a more excellent way.

Again he spoke to me, and told me how at that time his breaking heart cried for the strong consolation of a still more beautiful sight of the beauty of the Lord, 'O Lord, show me thy glory.' Now glory is nothing else than the full blaze of beauty. He was told that as yet he could not see all that there was to see, but his longing soul was satisfied by the Lord's own proclaiming of His name, 'The Lord, the Lord, a God merciful and gracious, long-suffering and abundant in goodness and truth, keeping mercy for thousands, forgiving iniquity and transgression and sin, and that will

by no means clear the guilty.' That is the beauty of God who is a Spirit, the beauty of His delighting in mercy. Only that beauty is well-ordered, and sinners who desire it will strip off their own ornaments, and then they will get beauty for ashes, and the oil of joy for mourning. And Moses found grace in the Lord's sight for himself and for the Lord's people, and he received the assurance that the Lord's presence would go with them according to His name.

And I remembered that when Moses came down from the Mount his face was shining with a marvellous brightness—the overflow of the beauty of holiness and the beauty of blessedness from the full heart of one with whom the Lord had spoken face to face.

But one thing troubled me. 'Please, sir, John says that while the Law was given through you, grace and truth came through Jesus Christ. Now grace and beauty are the same thing, and yet John ignores any knowledge in you of such a thing.'

'Why,' he said, 'Paul explained that, when he wrote that the glory that shone for a little on my face was no longer worth speaking of, after God shined to give the light of the knowledge of His glory in the face of Jesus Christ. And Paul also said that the Law, engraven on stones, was but a ministry of condemnation and death, and that was exactly what I found it. After the sin of the golden calf, there would have been no renewing of the broken tables of the Law, nor any people to renew them to, unless we had found more than Law with the Lord. But we found grace, and wholly and solely according to the beauty of His name. If any Jews or moralists rest upon the Law, instead of glorying in the name of the Lord, it is not my fault, any more than it is the fault of John or Paul, if any believers deceive themselves into living a lawless life because grace abounds.'

'The Law is God's holy and just and good way of making us know our sin, and although it slays us, its demand is a righteous one and a loving one. "From his right hand went a fiery law for them, yea, he loved the people." Is it not in love that a good mother lays down her law most strictly, that her children do not spoil their beauty with bad tempers, bad words, bad conduct? And when they do behave badly, her motherhood will sometimes seem to them to be

"all law." Yet it is "all love," and the love shines forth in its beauty when she is found burdening herself with no end of trouble for them, to win their very hearts to be in love both with herself and her law. Now the Lord showed that beauty of His love to us, in His gracious name, and in dealing with us according to His name; and many a heart in Israel has melted under His grace, and got the witness in itself both of His forgiveness and of His life-giving Holy Spirit, and in the joy of His salvation they have cried, "How great is His goodness, and how great is His beauty!"

'But John and Paul were perfectly right in judging that it was not until God sent forth His Son, that anybody had any idea of the real full truth as to the unsearchable riches of His beauty and grace. But I, said Moses, was one of the very first to know it. Know you the grandest honour that I ever had? It was when Elijah and I were commissioned from glory to attend on the King in the beauty of His transfiguration. And know you what we talked with Him of? Of how He was to take all that divine beauty of His into the midst of death, till it should all seem to be for ever quenched in death, the wages of sin, with Himself forsaken of God, and despised and rejected of men, having no comeliness or beauty that they should desire Him. Yet there was the hiding of His power; and in the beauty of obedience to His Father, and in the beauty of love for a world's salvation, He stood in the breach, and by the sacrifice of Himself made reconciliation for iniquity, and was lifted up as the serpent was in the wilderness. And God raised Him from the dead and gave Him glory, and sent forth His Holy Spirit to open men's eyes to look again, and see that God was in Jesus Christ, reconciling the world unto Himself. For all have sinned and all come short of the glory of God, but God was in His Son Jesus, and in Him crucified, bringing His glory near to the law-condemned, and in its uttermost beauty and grace and righteousness.'

'Now if you and your young folks and old are to deal rightly with my old prayer, you must bring both it and yourselves every day into the light in which God shines in the face of Jesus. Lawfully you may pray it as you open your eyes on the beauty of nature, and on the beauty of the sanctuary, and on the beauty of visions of God,

and on the beauty of babes and sucklings, and on the beauty of great men's lives, and, above all, on the beauty of the name of the Lord declared to me; yet you will not get the fulness of the blessing, unless every day you bring both the prayer and your own selves fully into the light of the face of the Lord Jesus. He is the brightness of God's glory. He is the Word of God that was made flesh; and God magnified His word above all His name, so that in Him the guilty can find a clearing which leaves no more condemnation, and in Him they can see the face of God and live and find life abundantly. But how shall you escape if you neglect so great salvation? Be jealous over yourselves, lest by easy sloth and neglect the pleasant plant of my prayer wither in your hearts and homes, and be a gift received in vain, much admired and most desirable, but the soul of the sluggard desirer, and hath nothing. But if day by day you bring yourselves and my prayer under God's shining in the face of Jesus and in all His

travail of soul for you, then you will never fail to get blossoms of beauty, and renewed and multiplied with more beauty and more grace all your life long—beauties of godly sorrow and earnest repentance; beauties of the peace of God, and of power by His Spirit to newness of heart and of hope; beauties of loins girt up to well-doing and of perseverance and of patience; beauties of the sacrifice of self for the work of the Lord; beauties of many a refreshing and restoring of soul; beauties of love at home, and of brotherly love; beauties of the heart's thought set on whatsoever things are lovely, and delivered from all unloveliness of spirit; beauties of being kept by the power of God through faith unto that heavenly salvation, in which, seeing your Lord and Saviour as He is, in His glory, you shall be like Him, your names written in Heaven in the Lamb's Book of Life. Great grace be upon you all. The beauty of the Lord our God be upon us.'

JAMES HENDRY.

Forres.

Harnack and Moffatt on the Date of the First Gospel.

BY THE VEN. WILLOUGHBY C. ALLEN, M.A., LECTURER IN THE HISTORY OF DOCTRINE
IN THE UNIVERSITY, AND ARCHDEACON OF MANCHESTER.

IN his recent and very remarkable work on the date of the Synoptic Gospels,¹ Harnack places the First Gospel immediately after the Fall of Jerusalem, but admits that the composition of the book before that event is not certainly disproved. He rejects the view that chaps. 1 and 2 are non-Palestinian and late. There is nothing in 1¹⁸⁻²⁵ which cannot have been written about 70 A.D. The sojourn in Egypt is possibly historical. The stories of Herod and the Magi need not be late. 16^{17ff.} and 18^{15ff.} may be early, but are more probably later interpolations into the Gospel. The stories of the death of Judas, of Pilate and his wife, contain nothing which could not have been related at a very early date. The legend of the rising of the dead saints 'seems to me to be ancient (uralt).'² 28⁹⁻¹⁰ does not belong to the original form of the Gospel, and does not therefore affect the date.

¹ 'Neue Untersuchungen zur Apostelgeschichte' (*Beiträge zur Einl. in das N.T.*, iv. Heft). 1911.

28^{16ff.} is ancient, but the words ascribed to the Risen Christ are perhaps a later interpolation. However, this does not follow from the Trinitarian formula. 27⁶²⁻⁶⁶ and 28^{2ff.} 11-15 may have been narrated very early. The place of composition was Palestine. The Gospel is the book of that law-emancipated Christianity which stood in sharp opposition to the Scribes and Pharisees. It originated amongst the Hellenistic Jewish-Christians, who at an earlier period were represented by Stephen, and from amongst whom missionaries had preached the Gospel at Antioch to the heathen.

It is the purpose of the following pages to urge that Harnack's position as outlined above can only be a temporary one, and that the Fall of Jerusalem is not an important factor in the discussion as to the date of the Gospel. If that factor be put aside, the next important point is the date of St. Mark, and if that Gospel could be thrown back

behind the early part of the sixties to which Harnack assigns it (though with the admission that this may be the date rather of an edition than of a first writing of the book), there are many features in the First Gospel which suggest a date nearer 50 than 70 A.D.

1. Harnack's admission that the matter peculiar to the First Gospel is for the most part of an early character, with the possible exception of one or two passages which may be later interpolations, destroys all the evidence for a date after the year 70. For 22⁷, to which Harnack appeals, is no certain witness that the Fall of Jerusalem was accomplished when the Evangelist wrote. Indeed, Harnack himself is half inclined to place the Gospel in the late sixties. Moffatt,¹ on the other hand, argues rather dogmatically for a date after 70, but his only arguments are—(1) That St. Mark in its present form was completed after that date, and that therefore St. Matthew is later. Against the first part of this see Harnack, pp. 88ff. (2) 'The general impression that a considerable period has elapsed since the days of Jesus, during which the Church has become organised and faith developed.' On this see below. In any case, 'a considerable period' need not bring the Gospel later than the year 70. Moffatt's only real reason is the dependence of the First Gospel on the Second, and the assumption that the Second Gospel dates about 70.

2. Admitting then, with Harnack, that the year 70 is a *terminus ad quem* rather than a *terminus a quo* for the First Gospel, we ask when and where it is most likely to have been written? The place must have been Syria or Palestine, but more probably the former than the latter, for the fact that the book was written in Greek points rather to Antioch than to Jerusalem. Moreover, the publication of a book so anti-Scribal would be easier at Antioch than at the capital of Palestine. The Greek language, the anti-Scribal tone point to Antioch. The relation of the Evangelist to the Law, the implied character of the Church, and the eschatology all point to an early rather than to a late date.

1. Relation to the law. Harnack describes the Gospel as the book of the law-emancipated Jewish-Christianity. Of course if by law, Scribal law is meant, the description suits the Gospel, for the book is largely a polemic against the Scribes and

all their works. But an evangelist who from beginning to end of his book assumes that the Mosaic Law is still the law of the community of the Messiah, can hardly be termed law-emancipated. How can a writer who at the beginning of his book places the sermon in which Christ is represented as asserting the permanent validity of the Mosaic Law be regarded as law-emancipated? Or what sort of freedom from law had the writer who, when he read in his St. Mark that Christ had abolished distinctions between clean and unclean meats, made so subtle a change that his readers would believe that what Christ had done away with was not these distinctions but the Scribal rules about hand-washing? Or what sort of freedom from the law had he and the community for whom he wrote that Christ bade them observe the Deuteronomic law of the two witnesses, and the law of the Sabbath? The writer and his readers are clearly members of a community which regarded itself as bound by the Mosaic Law, though free from the burden of the Scribal traditions. They represent that quite natural position of the first disciples of Christ, who, believing Him to be the Messiah, took it for granted that He was the fulfiller of the Mosaic Law, not in the sense of abrogating, but of interpreting it in a sense which should enhance its value. From this point of view the book might well proceed from the earliest days of the community at Jerusalem. But when we take into account the anti-Scribal polemic, it will be more natural to find the writer's home a little later at such a centre of controversy as Antioch. There Greek was the natural language for a Gospel. There rather than at Jerusalem St. Mark's Gospel would be found. There as well as at Jerusalem were the representatives of the older type of Jewish Christianity which took it for granted that the Jewish Messiah had reasserted the supreme sanctity of the law, and that His disciples were still bound by it.

2. The implied character of the Church. Moffatt, as quoted above, speaks of 'the general impression that a considerable period has elapsed since the days of Jesus, during which the Church has become organised and faith developed.' Is there any ground for such an impression? How long a period need have elapsed for a community to exist in which the officials could be termed 'wise men and scribes'? How long for a community to arise in which St. Peter was regarded as

¹ *Introduction to the Literature of the N.T.*, p. 214ff.
Edinburgh: T. & T. Clark, 1911.

the spokesman and legislator? How long for a community to spring into being in which it was assumed as a matter of course that the ecclesia of the Jewish Messiah must consist of Jews, and of proselytes?¹ For nothing which is said in the Gospel anywhere suggests that the Gentiles, to whom the Gospel was to be preached (just as according to the prophets Judaism was to be preached to them), were to be excused from the obligations of the law. The earlier we can place the Gospel the easier it is to account for the description of the community implied in it, with its exclusive character and its primitive constitution. And the earlier we place it the easier it is to account for its reception by the Western Church as a sacred book. For if written in Palestine, as Harnack thinks, near the year 70 (after St. Mark and St. Luke), or if written, as Moffatt thinks, between 70 and 110, why should the Church, which already possessed St. Mark and the Book of Sayings, which was used by the writer of the First, and, as many think, by the writers of the Second and Third Gospels, receive from Palestine a new Gospel, which transformed the Christ of the Universal Church into a Jewish Messiah, and recast His language in technical terms of Jewish devotion? Or, once again, 'a considerable period has elapsed . . . during which . . . faith has developed.' Is, then, the eschatological teaching of the Gospel a late development? Which is earliest, the eschatological teaching of the Thessalonian Epistles and of the early chapters of the Acts, or the universalism of Romans or of St. Luke? How is it conceivable that a Gospel which contains teaching like this could have been written at the latest more than a few years after the year 70? Harnack is right here when he says that he could believe that the Gospel was written before the Fall of Jerusalem more easily than he could suppose that it was written even ten years after that event.² Moffatt says that the editor's anticipation of a prolonged period during which the Gentile mission was to proceed apace is of more moment than the eschatology, and appeals to 28²⁰. That verse is a poor haven, for nothing is more certain than that the editor believed the end of the age which is there spoken of to be within the lifetime of the contemporaries of Christ.

¹ 'The Alleged Catholicism of the First Gospel' (THE EXPOSITORY TIMES, July 1910).

² P. 94, footnote 1.

On all these grounds, therefore, the relation of its Evangelist to the law, its limitation of the membership of the ecclesia to Jews and proselytes, its primitive organization, its eschatological teaching, the earlier the Gospel can be placed the better. What is there to prevent our dating it about the year 50?

'The literary dependence on Mk is by itself sufficient to disprove all such hypotheses,' says Moffatt. This is too strongly worded, for criticism is already beginning to move backwards for the date of St. Mark. Wellhausen has declared for a Palestinian origin, and seems inclined to favour a date between 50 and 60. Harnack still holds to the tradition which connects the Gospel with Rome and the presence there of St. Peter and St. Paul, but he thinks that whilst the Gospel may have been edited at Rome, it had been written earlier.³ The present writer has elsewhere tried to show that there are reasons for thinking that our present St. Mark is a translation from an Aramaic original.⁴ However that may be, the Council at Jerusalem is the event with which the composition of the two Gospels should be connected, rather than the Fall of Jerusalem. About that period St. Mark was probably brought into the form in which it was used a year or two later by the writer of the First Gospel.

So far we have been dealing with aspects of the First Gospel which are rather incidental than primary. If we turn to the main purpose with which the book was written the argument for an early date becomes even stronger. Let me try to summarize in a few words the main object of the work and the situation of its writer and readers.

The writer is a member of a community of Jewish-Christians who have put their faith in Jesus as the Messiah. They believe that He is shortly to return to them to inaugurate the Messianic Kingdom. Meanwhile they are to obey His teaching, and win converts to Him. Their most bitter opponents are the Scribes and Pharisees who slander Jesus as base born, and accuse Him of blasphemy against the Mosaic Law. The Evangelist wishes to rebut these slanders and to prove that in spite of all appearances to the contrary Jesus was the true Messianic King, of the line of

³ The present writer has already suggested this. 'The Alleged Catholicism,' etc., *ibid.*, p. 443.

⁴ *Studies in the Synoptic Problem.* Oxford, 1911.

David, who had been foretold by the Prophets. If we do not read the book through 'Catholic' spectacles, we shall see that the community thus presupposed is not the Pauline Ecclesia, but the exclusive Jewish-Christian Ecclesia of the early days of Christianity.

On the other hand, what has such a book as this to do with the period after 70 A.D.? Who needed, then, to have detailed proof that Jesus was the Messiah of the Jews? Not the Catholic Church, for it had long adopted the position that He was Christ, not of the Jew only but of the Gentile also. Not the Jewish-Christian Church, for the Fall of Jerusalem had temporarily removed the stress of controversy between themselves and the Scribal party. Controversy of that kind was renewed in the second century when the Jews had had time to recover from the shock of the break up of their national life. And it would be perhaps easier to suppose that the Gospel was written in the second

century than it is to think that it was written in the first two decades after the year 70 A.D. In a book so filled as is this with the heat of controversy, we should certainly have had in the latter case, not the obscure allusions to the Fall of Jerusalem which the modern critic professes to find there, but some sure hint that judgment had at last fallen on the Jewish authorities for their stubborn resistance to Israel's Messiah.

Once accept a date before the year 70, and the earlier we can go back the more intelligible does the book become. The atmosphere in which it was written is that of the early days when St. Peter was practically Primate of the Church in Palestine, when Scribes and Pharisees were foes to be dreaded because they could persecute, and when, whatever others might do, the Palestinian ecclesia of the Messiah held itself stiffly for the Mosaic Law, because it believed that that Law had been re-sanctioned by the Messiah Himself.

The Great Text Commentary.

THE GREAT TEXTS OF THE PSALMS.

PSALM XXXVII. 7.

'Rest in the Lord, and wait patiently for him.'

1. In the first verse of this priceless Psalm the Lord found His servant liable to fretfulness and envy, and He exhorted him to cease from fretting; then, in verse three, He taught him to trust; in verse four He led him on to delight; in verses five and six He conducted him into a peaceful committing of his way to God; and He did not stay the operation of His grace till He had perfected that which concerned him, and brought him up to the elevated point of the text: 'Rest in the Lord, and wait patiently for him.'

2. 'Rest in the Lord, and wait patiently for him.' These words are the climax of the series of steps on which the Psalmist here dwells, and they express in a sentence the entire spirit and theory of what has gone before. They have been married to immortal music, but they hardly need music to interpret them, or to express or embalm them. They are a melody in themselves, and they have come down in many a generation upon troubled

and anxious hearts like the gracious rain that has come down upon the withered herbage and blossoms of our world.

We all feel something of what it means. The very words have in them a sort of peaceful music :

Music that gentlier on the spirit lies
Than tir'd eyelids upon tir'd eyes.

'Rest in the Lord, and wait patiently for him':

Such words have power to quiet
The restless pulse of care;
And come like the benediction
That follows after prayer.

But they may be much more to us than a pleasant sound of peace; they may be a deep principle of calm, strong, trustful life.¹

I.

REST IN THE LORD.

Restlessness seems to be inseparably connected with humanity. How restful is nature. How beautiful she appears on a summer's evening, when the setting sun bestows on the landscape a parting

¹ B. Herford, *Courage and Cheer*, 251.

gift of glory, when the voice of the zephyr murmurs the tired earth's lullaby, and when all things seem sinking into rest. Beautiful? Yes; but suggestive of a mournful and startling contrast:

For, in the deepest hour of nature's peace,
The human heart's disquiet will not cease.

Yet rest cannot be quite impossible for man, for it has been occasionally achieved. The Psalmist, for example, had practised what we find him preaching in our text. 'The Lord is my shepherd,' he says, 'I shall not want. He maketh me to lie down in green pastures; he leadeth me beside the still waters. . . . Yea, though I walk through the valley of the shadow of death, I will fear no evil; for thou art with me.' 'My soul waiteth upon God. My expectation is from him. He is my rock and my defence. I shall not be moved.' Faber, too, had attained to a restfulness not less perfect than the Psalmist's. You remember his words:

I love to trace each print where Thou
Hast set Thine unseen feet.
I cannot fear Thee, Blessed Will,
Thine empire is so sweet.

I love to lose my will in Thine,
And by that loss be free,
I find my strength in helplessness,
And meekly wait on Thee.

Ill that God blesses is our good,
And unblest good is ill,
And all is right that seems most wrong
If it be Thy sweet will.

1. The literal meaning of the word 'rest' is 'be silent'—'be silent' towards the Lord. With the eye fixed on Him let all unbelieving thoughts be stilled, such thoughts as rise and rankle in the querulous spirit when it sees only its troubles, and not God in them, when the mists of earth hide from its sight the eternal stars of heaven. Then, like Jacob, we may say morosely, 'All these things are against me'; or, like Elijah, despondingly, 'It is enough, now, O Lord, take away my life'; or, like Jonah, fretfully, 'I do well to be angry.' In regard to all such dark and unbelieving suggestions, the heart is to keep silence, to be still and know that He is God; silent as to murmuring, but not silent as to prayer, for in that holy and meditative stillness, the heart turns to commune with Him. What is 'resting in God' but the instinctive movement and upward glance of the spirit to Him;

the confiding of all one's griefs and fears to Him, and feeling strengthened, patient, hopeful in the act of doing so.

There is a pathetic illustration of silence to God in the case of Aaron when his sons had offered strange fire, and had died before the Lord for their disobedience and sacrilege. The record says: 'And Aaron held his peace.' He even made no natural human outcry of grief. He accepted the terrible penalty as unquestionably just, and bowed in the acquiescence of faith.

The gift of quietness is, first of all, the gift of growth. We are like the roses in this respect. I have a friend who is a great gardener. In the days when he knew little about gardening he always wondered why the stake was thrust deep into the ground by his standard roses. On one occasion, seeing the gardener at his work, he said to him, 'I suppose the stake is by the rose tree to keep the tops from blowing about?' 'No,' said the gardener, with a smile, 'the stake is by the rose tree not to keep its top steady, but to keep the root still; for unless there is stillness at the root things won't grow.' Thank God for the stake in our lives that keeps the root still; thank God that there you can see, as with roses, *growth*.

2. The secret of this rest is in *submission*. It is the spirit exhibited so beautifully in all the three Marys. In her whose only answer to the most wonderful revelation ever made to human being was, 'Behold the handmaid of the Lord; be it unto me according to thy word'; and of whom, as mysteries multiplied around her it is written, 'Mary kept all these things, and pondered them in her heart.' And in her who 'sat at Jesus' feet, and heard his word,' and who showed, in anointing Him for His burial, how she had entered more deeply into the mystery of His death than even the beloved disciple. And in her, too, who sought her Lord in the house of the Pharisee with tears that spake more than words. It is a soul silent unto God that is the best preparation for knowing Jesus, and for holding fast the blessings He bestows. It is when the soul is hushed in silent awe and worship before the Holy Presence that reveals itself within, that the still small voice of the blessed Spirit will be heard.

When I was in Athens some years ago I was struck, not only with the exquisite beauty of the architecture and sculpture, but also with the soft golden colour of the marble, toned as it has been by the sunshine and showers of over two thousand four hundred years. I availed myself of an opportunity for climbing Pentelicus, not only that I might see the Bay of Marathon when the sun rose, but also that I might visit the great quarries from which all the marble had been taken. Now imagine one block of marble standing there

in its lonely grandeur for centuries, undisturbed and unthreatened, suddenly being attacked by the Athenian workmen employed by Pericles. By many a blow, and by many a desperate pull, they would at last detach it, and it would be rolled down to lower levels far from the serene heights of its quiet rest. Humbled and broken, ready to become anything, it would be sawn and chipped, carried away over rough roads to the city, and there, by hammer and chisel, would have to submit itself to the sculptor's hands. Rest would be exchanged for turmoil, freedom for submission ; but what of the result ? Instead of the loneliness of death on the mountain-top, it would be for ages to come the presentation of life in its most beautiful form. Thus the block of Pentelicus became the ornament of the Parthenon. Think you not that if any man may do thus with dead matter, God can and will shape each of us aright ? Will He not, by trials, temptations, and vexations, transform Christian character into the image of His Son ? And at last, as the perfect work of Phidias was raised on high, so the perfected man who waits and trusts will be manifested in glory.¹

Let nothing make thee sad or fretful,
Or too regretful,
Be still, what God hath ordered must be right,
Then find in it thine own delight,
My will.

But oh, be steadfast, never waver,
Nor seek earth's favour,
But rest. Thou know'st God's will must ever be
For all His creatures, so for thee
The best.

3. What are the things that prevent us from resting in the Lord ?

(1) *There is so much to do.* But resting need not prevent us from doing. What is the hardest element in the toils and labours of life ? Is it the mere exertion we have to make, and keep on making, in the doing of them ? No, indeed. It is the fret and worry with which we do them—the fretfulness we feel because the conditions under which we work are not as we would have them ; and the anxiety we feel as to what the result is going to be. Now, here it is that rest is possible even during work. A man may 'rest in the Lord' even while he is busily occupied, while he is still going right on with what he has on hand—not resting his hands, perhaps not even resting his brain, but resting his heart, resting his soul. There are those, as Keble says :

Who carry music in their heart,
Through dusky lane and wrangling mart ;
Plying their daily task with busier feet,
Because their secret souls a holy strain repeat.

¹ A. Rowland, *The Burdens of Life*, 94.

And there is no strain more helpful to the 'busier feet' than this of 'resting in the Lord.' For it is no music of the folded hands, but of the resting heart,—feeling another, larger will than ours in the whole conditions amid which we have to work, and in that larger will resting, even while working.

Do you remember that prayer of one of the captains in the old Puritan times, on the morning of a great battle : 'Lord, Thou knowest that I must be busy to-day ; but if I forget Thee, do not Thou forget me !' A noble word, that ; noble in its manly honesty. Depend upon it, a man who goes into his work in that spirit, remembering God, when his work is over will not only rest, but rest in the Lord.

(2) *We are anxious about the results.* But what is to be the final outcome of our work,—this also is, in the reality of things, God's concern, not ours. Our care is still, simply to do our best. This is true from the least things to the greatest. It is true for the farmer sowing his seed ; it is true for the business man carrying out his far-reaching enterprises ; it is true for the statesman toiling for the welfare of a nation ; it is true for the philanthropist labouring for the improvement of the world, and the prophet spending himself for the coming of the Kingdom of God. Whatever we have in hand let us try to see what is the right thing to aim for, accept the conditions as we find them, look forward as far as we can see, and—do our part faithfully—and then, for the issue, rest in the Lord.

The Master of us all met with disappointment on every hand. The people whom He so longed to save would not be saved in *His* way—the only way that had any real salvation in it. The disciples into whom He tried to infuse His own thought and spirit were disputing which should be the greatest the very night before His crucifixion. Of all that 'year of the Lord,' there was not, at the end, enough visible results to have made even the meagrest kind of an Annual Report. But, all through, He had rested in the Lord, and gone about doing good ; and even when His whole life-work seemed, humanly, most a failure, He still rested in the Lord ; and now we know, both what sweet peace and trust He found in God, and how that trust was justified.

(3) *There is the uncertainty about the future.* The future is dim, after all our straining to see into its depths. The future is threatening, after all our efforts to prepare for its coming storms. A rolling vapour veils it all ; here and there a

mountain peak seems to stand out; but in a moment another swirl of the fog hides it from us. We know so little, and what we do know is so sad, that the ignorance of what may be, and the certainty of what must be, equally disturb us with hopes which melt into fears, and forebodings which consolidate into certainties. We are sure that in that future are losses, and sorrows, and death; thank God! we are sure, too, that He is in it. That certainty alone, and what comes of it, makes it possible for a thoughtful man to face to-morrow without fear or tumult. The only rest from apprehensions which are but too reasonable is 'rest in the Lord.' If we are sure that He will be there, and if we delight in Him, then we can afford to say, 'As for all the rest, let it be as He wills, it will be well.' That thought alone will give calmness.

Why should'st thou fill to-day with sorrow
About to-morrow,
My heart?
One watches all with care most true,
Doubt not that He will give thee, too,
Thy part.¹

4. One thing remains, and it is the most important thing. We must rest *in the Lord*. Let us therefore see that we are where He is to be found. When Zacchaeus wanted to see Christ he climbed a tree along the route that Christ was coming. When the poor blind man wanted to find Jesus he went where Jesus was. But is it not the case that we have plenty of professedly Christian people who never put their hand to the plough of Christian work?

Labour is o'er;
Daylight is gone;
Toil we no more!
Night cometh on.
Tired grow our hands
As twilight grows dim—
'God loveth weary ones'—
Rest we in Him!

Weary with labour,
Toiling for bread?
In love for thy neighbour
Is't thou hast sped?
Working for others
Wearied each limb?
God loves such weary ones;
Rest thou in Him!

Or, for mankind
Spendest thy might?
Bringing the blind'
Back into light?
Bright rays of holiness
To the soul, dim?
God loves such weary ones!
Rest thou in Him!

Always when weary,
Fighting our way
Through the path dreary
Leading to *day*,—
Life's cup of sorrow
Filled to the brim—
'God loveth weary ones,'—
Rest we in Him!

And when the soul
Ceaseth from strife,
Weary and worn
In the battle of life,—
Then, as our life
Like a lamp groweth dim—
'God loveth weary ones,'—
Rest we in Him!

II.

WAIT PATIENTLY FOR HIM.

True, waiting is one of the hardest things in all the world. We talk of hard work. We should talk sometimes of hard waiting.* For work is often sweet and satisfying. But waiting seldom is. Did you ever wait at a wayside station for a train? The minutes seem like hours. Their feet are leaden. We should almost think time's sand-glass was choked. Had we been working, playing, travelling, how swiftly these moments would have gone. But we were waiting. And the time limps and lags. For we have never learned the secret of waiting well.

Bulstrode Whytlock was bound for Sweden with most important dispatches to its Government from our own. He had reached Harwich, and in order to prevent war and no end of mischief it was most desirable that he should be able to sail on the morrow. But that night, oh, how the wind did whistle, and how outside the harbour the ocean kept rushing and booming! and the anxious ambassador lay measuring as well as he could with his ear the strength of each blast. After midnight his secretary came in and found his chief wakeful and excited, and, learning the reason, he asked, 'But, sir, did not the Almighty govern the world before you were born?' 'Yes.' 'And won't He govern it after you are gone?' 'Yes.' 'And if His winds and waves should keep you a prisoner here all this month, will not He go on and govern the world even though Mr.

¹ Paul Fleming.

Whytlock is confined to Harwich?¹ This thought gave rest first to the mind and then to the body of the agitated envoy. He fell asleep, and awoke to find that the day would suit delightfully for the intended voyage.¹

Did you ever watch an untrained collie with the sheep? You know at once it is untrained because it never waits the shepherd's word. It barks and pants and chases. It works heroically. And after all is done, nothing is done. The sheep are dazed. The shepherd is in a temper. The poor dog has been doing mischief and not service. It had far better been asleep and dreaming by the peat fire than this. But the trained collie says in his own dog-Latin to the shepherd, 'Take my will and make it thine.' He waits upon the shepherd, and will not stir without his word. And his service is often wonderful, just because he has learned to wait.

Not long ago we were all thrilled by the news that one of the bravest men in the British army had been murdered on the Indian frontier. His name was Henry Havelock Allan. If ever there was a man who loved the battle, it was he. He was a noble warrior. But he was a noble waiter too. Once when a lad of some eight years his father, General Havelock, took him to London, whither he was going on business. There was a well-known clergyman with them, Dr. Brock. When the three were passing over London Bridge, the father bade his son wait in one of the recesses of the bridge, till he and his friend paid their business call. This was about noon. And business so engrossed them that when the call was over, they forgot all about the lad. At six in the evening Henry was remembered. It flashed upon the General when dinner was announced and Henry was nowhere to be found, that six hours before he had left his son standing on London Bridge. Jumping into a cab, he hurried to the bridge, and there was his boy, not one whit the worse, waiting like a true son and soldier for his father.²

1. This waiting upon the Lord and upon the words and will of Heaven is no idle laziness, it is no abstaining from labour, but, in fact, the highest result and crown of the best spiritual labour we can give.

In that great battle which, in the beginning of this century, gained for Europe freedom from the ambitious projects of the first Napoleon, it stands upon record that one of our Highland regiments held their ground hour after hour under the deadly fire of the enemy. The cannon balls ploughed their way through the ranks. The splendid cavalry dashed themselves against a wall of living granite, and recoiled each time from the bristling steel and the deadly volley. The Emperor, whose tenure of power depended upon breaking up the compact array, was heard to exclaim, 'These soldiers seem rooted to the ground!' No! it was not a case of being rooted to the ground, as was seen a few hours afterwards, when the word of command was given, 'Charge!' it was simply a case

of waiting, of waiting patiently, and often as look and voice besought the British commander to order the advance, the reply was, 'Wait, maintain your position, everything depends upon your standing still.'³

2. Nor does it mean that we are to make no plans and use no means for the successful accomplishment of our purposes. It is when the Christian Church is up to date in its Christian service, and when all the machinery of the church and school and mission and for the help of humanity are in perfect order, that we can rest and believe that God will meanwhile help on His kingdom. We can rest, only when we are in harmony, and up to date with the will of God.

I know some engineers, and they tell me that the only time when they can have a few minutes' rest in the engine-room is not when everything is out of order and out of gear, but when every wheel is right, when every screw and crank is in its proper place, when every nut is tight, when every wheel is properly oiled, and when everything is in perfect condition—then they can rest.⁴

There is a little incident told of Mohammed which always seems to me to go right to the heart of the matter. One evening when his army was halting for the night, and camping, he heard one of his Arabs say, 'I will loose my camel, and commit it to God.' 'Friend,' said the prophet, 'Friend, tie thy camel, and then commit it to God.'⁵

3. But we must give attention to the word *patiently*. For this may be the testing word of the exhortation. There are many who may wait, but they do not wait patiently upon God. They soon lose heart and lose expectation. They think that everything is against them, because in the little space that they can cover, and the little vision that they possess, they cannot discern that for which they wait. This is especially the case with Christian men in their Christian work. They want the reaper to tread upon the very heels of him that sows the seed. They wish to gather in the harvest almost as soon as they have ploughed the soil or cast in the grain. If they have not a speedy return and speedy fruit they lose heart. They have no heart to sow if they are not able very speedily and very readily to reap also. They forget that they are fellow-workers with God, and that God's working-day is all time and all eternity.

We have prayed that God would quicken His steps among the stars; yet still He seems to tarry, till wondering impatience cries aloud, 'Why does He not hear us? Why does

¹ James Hamilton, *Works*, vi. 386, 387.

² G. H. Morrison.

³ J. Kay, *Paulus Christifer*, 84.

⁴ E. Hamilton.

⁵ B. Herford.

He not make an end of sin? If He be the Lord, why does He not make haste to save us and our poor devil-hunted world?' Was it not this that led even the sweet and gentle Whittier to say once, as he fought for the down-trodden slave of America, 'I confess when I think of the atrocities of slavery, I am almost ready to call for fire from heaven.' And I have heard of one who, when speaking of the desolations wrought in our own fair land by the thrice accursed drink traffic, cried in one passionate outburst, 'Oh, if only I were God Almighty for ten minutes!' It is this—'the godless look of earth,' as Faber calls it—that tries our faith far more than 'our mysterious creed'—

Ill masters good: good seems to change
To ill with greatest ease;
And worst of all, the good with good
Is at cross purposes.

And amid it all

He hides Himself so wondrously,
As though there were no God;
He is least seen when all the powers
Of ill are most abroad.

And this it is that stirs our doubt and quickens our impatience till we are ready to ask, 'Is God as man and could not if He would?' 'Rest in the Lord, and wait patiently for Him. Fret not thyself because of evil-doers. Commit thy way unto the Lord; trust also in Him and He shall bring it to pass.'¹

4. Why must we wait patiently?

(1) Because *impatience never forms a true estimate of evil*. Sometimes it overestimates it, sometimes it underestimates it, but it never rightly estimates it. It creates an atmosphere in which everything is blurred and distorted, which never allows us to see things as they really are.

There is a very instructive incident in the life of Ahaz, king of Israel, preserved for us in the Book of Isaiah. Syria and Ephraim had formed a confederacy against him, and the king was in great fear: 'His heart was moved, and the heart of his people as the trees of the forest are moved with the wind.' Then the prophet is sent unto him, and his first word is, 'Take heed and be quiet'; as long as you are in this flurry and flutter you will do nothing right—keep yourself still. Then when he has quieted the fears of the frightened king he bids him look the facts in the face. These his enemies—Ephraim and Syria—that are causing him to quake, what are they? 'two stumps of smoking firebrands!' 'The head of Syria is Damascus, and the head of Damascus is Rezin'—is he worth fearing? 'And the head of Ephraim

is Samaria, and the head of Samaria is Remaliah's son'—is he worth fearing? 'If you will not believe, surely you shall not be established.'

(2) Impatience always misses the remedy. Some one has pointed out the contrast between the calmness and sagacity of General Gordon, in the presence of the gigantic slave traffic in Africa, and the crude, hasty, well-meaning, but mistaken suggestions of philanthropists at home. What was the explanation? Gordon believed that God's hand was upon even this iniquity, that even of this hideous trafficking in flesh and blood God had said, 'Thus far shalt thou go, and no further'; and in that faith he could wait and watch and plan, till he saw the way clearly, which others in their impatience would never find.

Every now and again an African traveller comes home and assures us that the reports of foreign missionary work are exaggerated, that if we saw things as they see them we should not believe all we hear, that—you know the rest. Well, we take all that with a pretty big pinch of the proverbial salt; if we have to make our choice between the 'report' of the missionary and the 'report' of the traveller, some of us, at any rate, will not be long in making up our minds. But, perhaps, there is just enough truth in the traveller's depreciation of missionary work to give us a not unneeded warning. Who is to blame if missionary statistics sometimes creep ahead of actual facts? Not the missionary abroad, but Christians at home, who will only give where they can get 'something in return for their money.'

(3) Patience alone is justified in the end. The Lord reigneth; therein is the vindication of our patient waiting.

This fine old world of ours is but a child
Yet in the go-cart. Patience! Give it time
To learn its limbs; there is a hand that guides.

Alas! we forget the hand that guides. The noise of the water-floods is in our ears, that we cannot hear the voice of Him that sitteth as King above the floods. Still the old cry goes up to heaven: 'How long, O Lord! how long before Thou come again?'

'Still in cellar, and in garret and on moorland dreary,
The orphans moan, and widows weep, and poor men toil in vain.'

¹ G. Jackson, *The Table-Talk of Jesus*, 131.

And still does the answer come back to us:

'Blind! I live, I love, I reign; and all the nations through
With the thunder of my judgments even now are ringing.'

'Be patient; stablish your hearts; the coming of the Lord draweth nigh.'¹

Before I went into the ministry I used to like to go into the engine-house of the works where I was engaged. We

¹ G. Jackson.

had there what were called 'horizontals,' two of them, working like two mighty arms, each 600 horse power. It was something to stand and watch those mighty arms, moving almost in silence, and doing all the driving work of that big firm. It was an inspiration to stand and watch them. But out of sight there was the engine bed, high blocks of stone, cemented together, and if you moved one of those stones, the great arms would pull the place to pieces in a minute. Fixed and settled you had all that might fulfilling its purpose in silence. It is when the soul is fixed immovably to God that it can do all its work, and it is only then.²

² J. Whitehead.

Oxford Studies in the Synoptic Problem.

BY THE REV. ARTHUR WRIGHT, D.D., VICE-PRESIDENT OF QUEENS' COLLEGE, CAMBRIDGE.

AFTER seventeen years of careful deliberation Dr. Sanday and some members of his 'Seminar' have issued a volume of essays. Had they been unanimous in supporting the 'two document hypothesis,' or had they agreed about the nature and contents of the document which they call 'Q,' they might have caused considerable anxiety to the upholders of the oral hypothesis. But as one of them (Dr. Bartlet) issues a 'minority report,' in which he repudiates the two document hypothesis as far as 'Q' is concerned, and pronounces it inadequate with respect to St. Mark; while another (Mr. N. P. Williams) declares that the simplest explanation of St. Luke's omissions is that 'he omitted them because they were not in his copy of St. Mark'; while a third (Mr. Streeter) writes that "'Matthew'¹ and St. Luke would each have been a catechist before he became an Evangelist, and each would look least closely to his written source where he knew best his materials by heart,'—I for one am relieved to find that truths for which I have been contending during twenty-one years, have made such progress towards acceptance in the sister University, and I gladly rush into the fray to assist the independent thinkers with whom my sympathy lies.

And first, to show goodwill, let me supplement Dr. Sanday's account of the conditions under which the Gospels were written by two suggestions, one

of which he has perhaps overlooked, the other he has not cared to record. (1) The ancients had neither spectacles nor magnifying glasses. Since, therefore, some of them were admittedly men of sixty or upwards, it is reasonable to assume that their eyesight was imperfect. They could read a MS. when all was plain, but a blur or a blot would baffle them. In this way a believer in documents may most easily account for St. Luke's rendering of 8¹⁴ and of several other passages. (2) The ancients had no law of copyright. If a man possessed a MS. and took pains to correct it, his corrections might be accepted and would actually drive out 'the original readings.' In this way Cod. C of the Gospels underwent a grammatical revision, and Cod. D was shamelessly harmonized. There is therefore nothing strange in Dr. Sanday's contention, that our St. Mark is not derived from the book which St. Mark wrote, or from that copy of it which St. Luke and 'Matthew' made use of, but from a corrected copy which has superseded the original. I submit, however, that the loss of the last page of St. Mark points rather to the fact that his Gospel was not copied till St. Mark was dead. Nor is this surprising, for its short and severe chronicle could ill compete with the fuller and more attractive history which was current in Rome orally. If so, the revision must have been made by St. Mark himself, when he resolved to publish, or by some literary expert whose professional skill he employed. That there was such a revision is supported by the weighty authority of Sir John Hawkins, who

¹ The word 'Matthew' in inverted commas is used for brevity to signify the author of our first Gospel. Critics are now generally agreed in holding that Gospel in its present form to be the work of an unknown author.

writes: 'There are strong marks of a compiler's hand in our second Gospel,' and surely my doctrine of a trito-Mark is simpler and more probable than Dr. Sanday's of a revision by a stranger. St. Mark's anxiety to make his work acceptable fully accounts for the thorough overhauling to which it has been subjected. But what motive could induce the mere possessor of the MS. to spend so much labour upon it? The changes are not dogmatic, but literary. An author's vanity (if I may use the term without offence) will explain them, but an outsider would have small vanity to move him. 'Matthew' and St. Luke revised their work before publishing it, with equal pains.

Sir John would be ready to admit the doctrine of a proto-Mark, 'if he could discover any appreciable linguistic differences in different parts of (St. Mark's) Gospel.' But why should he require such differences or expect to find them? The proto-Mark was, I presume, the outcome of St. Peter's teaching and of St. Mark's translating during the early period before St. Paul carried off St. Mark to act as Chazzan on the first missionary journey. But St. Mark abruptly returned to Jerusalem and presumably resumed his translations there. Thus the deuter-Mark was the work of the same author (St. Peter), and the same translator (St. Mark), within a year or less of the completion of the proto-Mark. It finally underwent the same revision at the hands of St. Mark himself or of his literary expert. What room is there for any other differences than might arise from a little of that practice which makes perfect? Take a similar case. Jane Austen wrote three of her novels within three years. Who would expect to find literary differences between them? There might be such, if a candid friend or a curt reviewer had pointed out, for example, her blunders in the use of pronouns. If not, those blunders would be repeated, as in fact they are. Her mistakes in spelling were corrected by the printer, to remind us that even in the case of the Gospels we do not possess exactly the original text. On the whole, I see no reason to abandon the doctrine of a proto-Mark. It seems to me, as to Professor Stanton and to Mr. N. P. Williams, to be the simplest, if not the only possible solution of a complex problem. Dr. Sanday's persistent and pronounced hostility to it is remarkable.

It is, in my opinion, a capital fault in this volume that not a word is said in it about children and

their needs. Yet we can never understand the origin of the Gospels, unless we consider the children. The Church has always been zealous for religious education. In this respect, as in many others, the Apostles copied the synagogue, which was a school as much as a Church. Every synagogue had a Chazzan, who taught the boys during the week and waited upon the adults on the Sabbath. The boys, however, were his chief charge, for, if they were neglected, the cause of Judaism was lost and religion would have expired in a few generations. Now education in the East consisted in learning by heart. There was simply no other method. Jewish boys were taught to repeat the Law; Christian boys had some further lessons in the Gospels. Thus a body of Gospel teaching accumulated, which every boy knew in boyish fashion—lazily and imperfectly—but the Chazzan knew it perfectly. There are plenty of clergy even now, who can repeat the Church Catechism without missing or misplacing a word. And so it becomes impossible to maintain, what in this volume is often asserted or assumed, that when 'Matthew' or St. Luke preserve a *logion verbatim*, they cannot be trusting to oral tradition, but must needs be copying from a book. Close correspondence in wording merely proves close contact with the original teachers: diversity shows either that they followed a different Greek version (Papias says that several were in use), or that they received the record after it had passed through many minds and memories, every one of which distorted it a little. For in first learning changes are made; in later stages there is more fidelity. I recently showed (THE EXPOSITORY TIMES, xxi. 212) that Professor Stanton in his elaborate work on the Gospels has made the portentous mistake of leaving the children of the important Church at Jerusalem and in all the Syriac-speaking congregations without any history of the Crucifixion and the Resurrection for forty years. So fatal is it to concentrate attention on men and women but neglect the children. Grown-up men are catechized sometimes. In a negro school which I inspected at Philadelphia some grey heads were present, but they were the least promising of the scholars. No experienced teacher would advise a man of forty to learn by heart.

The words 'conflate' and 'conflation' occur many times in this volume, but the art of conflation is not fully discussed, as its intrinsic

importance demands. That 'Matthew' makes huge conflations, which cannot have been found in 'Q,' is freely conceded, but that St. Luke also systematically conflates is, I think, only once asserted. Dr. Bartlet prefers to think with Dr. Stanton, that St. Luke was little more than a copyist, fortunate enough to have his work prepared for him by Philip the Evangelist or by others. Sir William Ramsay, however, has vindicated for St. Luke the claim to be a first-rate literary historian. The number of such artists was limited, and it seems more probable that St. Luke, who was capable of doing the work, actually did it, than that he trusted to others. That he had kept a commonplace book and entered into it all the fragments of deutero-Markan or other matter which reached him, and worked them up at last into discourses, is far simpler than to imagine that so many *logia* were found in two sources. If St. Luke had them before him in his copy of St. Mark, why did not he use that copy to put them in their proper order? They are invariably misplaced.

Fragments are as numerous in the Gospels as my old pupil the Regius Professor of Hebrew in his forthcoming book will show them to be in Isaiah. The use of catchwords is as great in the Gospels as in the Prophets and Psalms, but no notice is taken of them in this book. Questions like these are, I venture to assert, more likely to reward the worker than the 'futile' attempt to reconstruct 'Q.' The documentary hypothesis neglects the genesis of the Gospels, only beginning to work at them after 70 A.D., when the most interesting phases have gone by. Let any one ask himself what happened when St. Mark sat down to write; and, if he admits that a document is simply oral tradition committed to writing, he will only have to work backwards to become a believer in the oral hypothesis. While I, on the other hand, concede freely that Matthew and St. Luke began their work of consolidation by committing all the traditions to writing, for, unless they had written records, I do not see how they could manipulate them as they have done. No one, unless it be Shakespeare, writes a good book without great destruction of paper.

Dr. Sanday insists upon the necessity of limiting the length of a book. He roundly asserts that books must be written to scale. This idea is not new, but has often been asserted in the last decade, first, I think, by Dean Armitage Robinson. St.

Luke, I venture to say, is much more likely in this matter to have followed the use of the synagogue than the dictation of his bookbinder. In the synagogue the whole Law is now written on one roll. There is a presumption that it was so in the first century. At any rate, Lk 4¹⁷ seems to assert that the prophecy of Isaiah was inscribed on one roll. Some doubt may possibly be felt about the exact meaning of the common text of that verse, for 'a roll of the prophet Isaiah' may mean that Isaiah consisted of several rolls—two or three volumes. But the Western reading, 'And there was given to him the prophet Isaiah, and he opened and read,' has much to recommend it. It is not the work of a harmonist, and therefore cannot be summarily rejected. It is short and sufficient, while the common text is prosy and conventional. It leaves no doubt that one roll contained the whole book. Now Isaiah has 66 chapters against St. Luke's 24. In a modern Bible he covers 104 pages, while St. Luke covers 40. He occupies, therefore, a roll two and a half times as great as St. Luke's, and gives us reason to maintain that stationers then, as now, were ready to sell you as many sheets of papyrus, cut to size, as you desired. Bookbinders also would take your sheets, when transcribed and numbered, glue them together, fasten them to a roller, smooth them with pumice, add a title, and enclose them in a case. Why not? Does any one believe that in Hellenic synagogues Genesis, Exodus, and other books were divided into two volumes each? Yet they are much longer than St. Luke's Gospel.

Again, the medieval picture of the four Evangelists writing their Gospels, which Professor Sanday has put for his frontispiece, is interesting as showing how authors worked in the West at the time of Charles the Great: it must, I am afraid, be pronounced worthless for illustrating work in the East during the apostolic period. Certainly the Apostles understood the use of a chair, for Isaiah speaks of the throne of God and St. Paul of the judgment seat of Christ. Roman magistrates also had chairs of state, and the chancel of a synagogue had a semicircle of chairs for the Rabbis. But chairs were not used in common life. Men reclined at meals on mats. Students squatted on a carpet. I have a photograph of a Jerusalem teacher and his pupils so placed, and I have never seen a student in the East occupy any other position. In the Coptic Church at Cairo the Patriarch kindly

supplied me with a chair, but he sent a choir-boy to borrow it from an Englishman's house, there being no such article of furniture in the church. As for tables, the floor makes an ample table; that and their knees are all the table that they possess. Low tables were used by the wealthy in imitation of Roman custom at the triclinium, but not in ordinary households. Nor were the ancients so careless in copying as the exigencies of Dr. Sanday's hypothesis makes him suppose. The scribes copied the Law with exactness, if not with the minute precision to which they afterwards attained. Tatian, in composing his *Diatessarón*, had the same task as that which confronted St. Luke, with the added difficulty of translating, but he performed it with creditable accuracy.

Dr. Bartlet does not tell us why he deems it certain that St. Luke had St. Mark's Gospel in writing before him as well as the oral record which he regularly preferred. The law of parsimony seems to militate against that idea, which, I suppose, is put forward from the common belief that oral tradition could not furnish the order, though it might suffice for the words. That idea has been often refuted. Once grip the fact that St. Luke frequently reproduces the proto-Mark, though St. Mark himself has abandoned it, and many of Dr. Bartlet's difficulties disappear.

Again, the editorial work of an ancient author was very serious. Think how Livy must have corrected his crude authorities to reduce them to literary form and infuse into them the graces of his inimitable style. Horace bids a beginner to take abundance of time, keeping back the work eight years for revision and polishing. Pliny the younger complains of a friend that he is using the file too freely: let him publish without further delay, or the graces of his work will be destroyed. There is abundance of editorial change in 'Matthew' and St. Luke, partly for theological reasons, to smooth away difficulties and give no handle to the enemy, partly for stylistic changes or to connect paragraphs. It is the first duty of a critic to distinguish editorial work and hold it cheaper than that which rests on sources.

There were two kinds of oral tradition—(1) the formal lesson committed to memory and regularly repeated; (2) the looser recollections of an oft-told tale. The writers in this book freely acknowledge the latter, but, with some exceptions, they are slow to admit the former. Hence they do not appreciate

the strength of the oral hypothesis. We await Harnack's book, in which the Gospels are going to be dated much earlier than we have ventured to demand. That the work of weaving four or five strands into one cord was done early, I have long maintained, but publication was a different thing. That St. Matthew's Gospel was put into its present form for the most part before the destruction of Jerusalem, is certain from the way in which the eschatological sections are arranged. But ten years of oral teaching probably passed before the final publication took place, during which the path to acceptance was smoothed by oral recitation. St. Luke certainly composed his Gospel before the destruction of the temple, but published it in a revised form long afterwards. To give a finished Gospel, like 'Matthew' or St. Luke, in place of the numerous disconnected traditions which were current orally, was nothing short of a revolution, and could only have been done tentatively and very gradually, so conservative are men's instincts in religious matters. The new Gospels were enormous improvements, but many men would cry, 'The old were good.'

I have learned much from the Oxford school, as will appear if I have health and strength to prepare the fourth edition of the Synopsis. I urge them therefore to continue their studies, as I hope to continue mine. I venture to predict that some of them eventually will not differ from me more than they now differ from one another.

For nearly forty years after the Ascension oral teaching admittedly supplied the need of Church schools, and thousands of Christian children were educated by it. Now St. Luke was the friend of St. Paul, he had gifts which eventually made him the historian of the Church, he was probably a church officer: it seems to me that when he reminded Theophilus of the catechizing of boyish days, he implied that he had been the catechist himself. Yet some people write as though St. Luke had suddenly discovered two documents, of whose contents he was as ignorant as Hilkiah was of the contents of the book of the Law which he found in the temple. Is that possible? To those who deny the existence of the Christian Church or minimize its activities, it may be conceivable that a dark veil of ignorance enveloped the world until our Gospels were written, but any one who has a sense of history, must deny this. Grant that the Church in the warmth of her first love

was at least as active in propagating the faith as the synagogue had taught her to be, and some sort of 'deposit' must have accumulated. The traditions on which our Gospels were founded were originally oral, and were the growth of many years' effort: the written Gospels were the fruit of a revolution.

Is it not high time frankly to admit that it has been a mistake to oppose the oral to the documentary hypothesis, as though they were rivals? In truth, they both played a part in the genesis of the Gospels. Oral teaching is always based on a document, though it be but a tablet and stylus, or an ostrakon. Every Chazzan or Catechist kept as many notes as his individual idiosyncrasies

demanded. Every Catechist who had proper Christian ambition kept a commonplace book in which to enter fugitive fragments. Many Catechists (as St. Luke tells us) made the attempt to weave into one cord the several strands of teaching. The task was too hard for the majority, and they seem to have abandoned it, but our four Gospels were created. Beside them the Gospel according to the Hebrews, the Gospel of the Nazarenes, the Gospel of St. Peter held their own in some quarters for some time. Oral teaching continued for many years; indeed, it has never ceased, but it was at last definitely founded on some books. Thus oral teaching and documents went hand in hand.

Literature.

THE AUTHORIZED VERSION.

THE Tercentenary of the Authorized Version has made a considerable stir in this and other English-speaking lands. And a fair amount of literature about the English Versions has come out of it. Already two or three books have been noticed.

Of the rest, we take first—*An exact Reprint in Roman Type, Page for Page, of the Authorized Version, published in the Year 1611*, which Mr. Frowde has issued at the Oxford University Press, under the editorship of Mr. A. W. Pollard (8s. 6d.). The type is small, of course, but it is quite legible, and evidently the utmost care has been taken to prevent error. Mr. Pollard's introduction is a rapid survey of the earlier translations into English.

Mr. Frowde has also published, and Mr. Pollard has again edited, *Records of the English Bible* (5s. net). This volume contains the documents relating to the translation and publication of the Bible in English from 1525 to 1611. And a most useful volume it will be. We have such curiosities in it as Sir Thomas More's 'Plan for a Limited Circulation.' It may safely be asserted that this book will be at hand when in future any man undertakes to write about the English Versions.

From Cambridge we have Dr. John Brown's *History of the English Bible* (1s. net). It is a volume of the new series entitled 'The Cambridge Manuals of Science and Literature.' It is from

Cambridge that the most important of all the literature called forth by the Tercentenary comes. This is an edition of the Psalms according to the six greatest English translations after Wyclif. The six are those of Coverdale (1535), the Great Bible (1539), the Geneva Version (1560), the Bishops' Bible (1568), the Authorized (1611) and the Revised Versions (1885). They are printed in three columns to the page. And as the editor is Dr. William Aldis Wright, the editing is unsurpassable. The title is *The Hexaplar Psalter* (25s. net).

Mr. Murray has issued a cheap (1s. net) edition of Mr. H. W. Hoare's book, *Our English Bible*.

More significant are two volumes issued by Messrs. Wells Gardner. One, under the title of *The English Bible* (2s. net), is 'an historical survey from the dawn of English history to the present day,' by the Rev. J. D. Payne, M.A., Vicar of Charlbury. The other is entitled *Testimonies to the Book* (1s. 6d. net). It is a collection, made by Mr. Frederick Sherlock, of the sayings of men and women about the Bible. Here is one saying—and from Napoleon: 'There are some men who are capable of believing everything but the Bible.'

Last of all, from the John Rylands Library, in Manchester, there comes a careful, helpful list of editions of the Bible contained in that library, with an introduction, presumably by the librarian, on the history of Bible translation (6d. net).

A SCOTS DIALECT DICTIONARY.

The impatient Englishman will desire first of all to know why 'Scots.' But no Scotsman would condescend to answer him. There are facts that are greater than the reasons that can be given for them. If you do not love, no one can tell you what love is. If you say Scotch, no one can tell you why you should say Scots. But you should.

The next question will be, Why another Scots Dictionary? Is not Jamieson enough? To that an answer can be given. Jamieson is ancient, this is modern Scots. The period covered by the new dictionary is from the latter part of the seventeenth century to the present day.

So the purpose of this book is to enable the Englishman to read his Kailyard literature with understanding. And not the Kailyard literature only, but also the innumerable poems and prose pieces he finds in the Scots Dialect even in his *Athenæum* or his *Nation*. It will help him greatly with Burns and Hogg and Wilson and many more—if he ever reads them. And, above all else, it will give him the key to the language of his landlady when he takes his holiday at Kingussie or Braemar.

But there is yet another use. This Scots Dialect Dictionary will enable him to read his Bible. For many of the words in the Authorized Version that are obsolete in England are still in use in Scotland; and (more important still) many words which are not obsolete, but have changed their meaning in England since 1611, have retained it in Scotland all the while.

And this gives an opportunity of supplementing Mr. Warrack in a small way. His article on *Cry* is full and satisfactory. He has also *Cry doon* and *Cry in*. But where is *Cry on* (or *upon*)? In Zec 6⁸ we read, 'Then cried he upon me, and spake unto me, saying.' This is the familiar Scots *cry on* for call or summon. There is a separate note on it in Driver's *Minor Prophets* ('Century Bible').

Did we say that the Dictionary is the work of the Rev. Alexander Warrack, M.A.? It is a most admirable book, enough to make a man's fame if not his fortune. The publishers are Messrs. W. & R. Chambers (7s. 6d. net).

THE NEW SCHAFF-HERZOG.

The regularity with which the volumes of *The New Schaff-Herzog Encyclopedia of Religious*

Knowledge appear is most remarkable and most admirable. Here are the eighth (from 'Morality' to 'Petersen') and the ninth (from 'Petri' to 'Reuchlin'). Three more complete the work (Funk & Wagnalls; 21s. net each volume).

The first article in the eighth volume is on 'Morality.' It is a condensation of Dr. Martin Rade's article in the Hauck-Herzog, and is of no value on account of the condensation. It occupies two and a half pages, whereas Rade's own article occupies nine and a half pages. It does not matter, however. The subject will be looked for by students under 'Ethics.'

More important is the series of articles on the Mormons. First there is an 'official' article, written by Mr. Joseph F. Smith, Jr.; next a critical (non-Mormon) statement by Professor J. R. van Pelt; then follows a note on the Reorganized Church of Jesus Christ of Latter-Day Saints, by Dr. H. K. Carroll, and another note by Mr. D. J. Macmillan on Anti-Mormon Movements.

Against the original German work on which this American work is based the articles on the Mormons show the strength of this Encyclopedia. But they are immediately followed by a number of biographies of American ministers and missionaries, which show its weakness. For they are rarely of encyclopedic importance.

From these biographies we pass to an article on Moses, abridged from that of Orelli in the Hauck-Herzog. It is careful and conservative, and it is worth consulting even by the possessor of a good Dictionary of the Bible, because of the position its author takes up on some of the disputed things in the narrative of Moses' life. Orelli holds, for example, that when Zipporah cast her son's foreskin at Moses' feet, and exclaimed, 'A bloody husband art thou to me,' she indicated that by her act she had saved her husband's life.

To Mysticism, so full of interest at the present time, and so fertile of misapprehension, four pages are allowed. But the bibliography is full and well chosen. A further service would have been rendered if the author of the bibliography had subdivided it, or in some way indicated the attitude of the books named.

In the ninth volume the greatest space has been afforded to the 'Presbyterians.' All the Presbyterian Churches have been gathered under the one title, and as each Church has a separate article, written by a separate author, it is not surprising

that forty pages are occupied with the subject. The articles are written by men who belong to the particular communion they describe. This is the best way, and indeed it is the only possible way with work of the kind. It is not that outsiders err in fact (which they always do), but that they offer a dead dog instead of a living lion.

Mr. Allenson has published a sixpenny edition of Westcott's *Gospel of the Resurrection*.

Mrs. Gustavus W. Hamilton has translated into English *The Roman Journals* of Gregorovius, as edited in German by Friedrich Althaus (Bell; 3s. 6d.). The translation is made from the second German edition.

Ferdinand Gregorovius was born at Neidenburg in East Prussia in 1821. Passing his youth in the old Teutonic castle there, of which his father was *Justiz-rath*, he was prepared, in imagination at least, to write his great *History of Rome in the Middle Ages*. In the year 1852 he travelled to Italy, and began the *Römische Tagebücher*, of which this is a translation. The journals cover that momentous period, 1852 to 1874, when the temporal power of the Pope passed for ever, and under the inspiration of Garibaldi there rose, not the vision only, but the realization of a United Italy.

It is needless to say that the style is vivid, the impressions staying, and the facts reliable. The translation has made the book an English classic.

The reputation of Professor Bernhard Duhm of Basle has never recovered the criticism of his earlier commentaries made by the late Professor A. B. Davidson. With all his output, not a page of his has been translated into English, until now when Professor Archibald Duff of Bradford has translated a recent address on *The Ever-Coming Kingdom of God* (Black; 2s. 6d. net). It contains, in very intelligible language, his theory of prophetic inspiration and his hope for the future of Christianity.

Is the *Apocalypse* read in school? The Cambridge Press has a series of commentaries on the Revised Version, edited for the use of schools, and to that series has been added *The Revelation* (1s. 6d. net), by the Bishop of Edinburgh.

To the 'Cambridge Manuals of Science and Literature,' Dr. E. G. King has contributed a volume on *Early Religious Poetry of the Hebrews* (Cambridge Press; 1s. net). By 'Religious Poetry' Dr. King means 'the whole outcome of that probation whereby the Suffering Nation was fitted to prepare the world for God.' And by 'Early' he means the Poetry of the Old Testament Times as distinguished from the Poetry of the Synagogue. The book is both literary and theological. It contains a discussion of the Strophe, and it contains an account of the Problem of Suffering.

The Oxford translation of Aristotle now consists of seven volumes. They are these: *Parva Naturalia*, translated by J. I. Beare and G. R. T. Ross; *De Lineis Insecabilibus*, by H. H. Joachim; *Metaphysica* (vol. viii.), by W. D. Ross; *De Mirabilibus Auscultationibus*, by L. D. Dowdall; *Historia Animalium* (vol. iv.), by D'Arcy W. Thompson; *De Generatione Animalium*, by A. Platt; and *De Partibus Animalium*, by W. Ogle.

Dr. Ogle's translation of the *De Partibus Animalium* (5s. net) is just out. It is as true scholarship and it has undergone as judicious editorship as any of the other volumes.

The second annual course of the Schweich Lectures was delivered in 1909 by Professor R. H. Kennett of Cambridge. The first course, it has not been forgotten, was delivered by Professor S. R. Driver of Oxford. In the second course, consisting of three lectures, Professor Kennett 'tells the story of the Book of Isaiah.' He does not write a new commentary on Isaiah; he gives us his ideas about the composition of the prophecies, their reference, and their collection. And he steadily sets the whole in the light of contemporary history. Do you seek an introduction to the study of Isaiah, whether as a student or a plain reader, an introduction after the latest knowledge and most uncompromising criticism? This is the book. Its title is *The Composition of the Book of Isaiah in the Light of History and Archaeology* (Frowde; 3s. net).

Very quietly, and to most people quite imperceptibly, the Rev. W. L. Walker is helping to create a revolution in thought and life. He is certainly one of the chief agents in the creation of that revolution from loose agnosticism to firm

faith in Christ which the discerning have recognized of late as undoubtedly going forward in this country. His books are large, but they sell. *The Spirit and the Incarnation* is moving through its second edition. And now *The Cross and the Kingdom* has passed into a second edition also, having been revised and partly rewritten (T. & T. Clark ; 9s.).

The new volume in Messrs. Constable's 'Philosophies Ancient and Modern' is *Epicurus* (1s. net); the author is Professor A. E. Taylor of St. Andrews. And it shows what can be done even with a great and difficult subject within 120 small pages when the author is a master both of the subject and of the English language. This small book may possibly make Professor Taylor better known; it will certainly make *Epicurus* better known.

How sane the modern book on the Second Coming seems to be. Perhaps to our sons and daughters it will seem fanatical. To us, comparing it with the arithmetical, enigmatical, apocalyptic book of the last generation it seems sane almost to commonplaceness. But how much more, because of its reticence, there is in it of life and godliness. The Rev. Hubert Brooke, M.A., has written a book of this kind, calling it *The Fact and Features of the Lord's Return* (Robert Scott ; 2s. net).

We receive in sorrow what we give in song—or in sermon. The Rev. W. J. Foxell, Rector of St. Swithin's, London Stone, E.C., having passed through the crushing sorrow of losing the wife he deeply loved, has set himself to give to others the comfort he has himself received of God. The Bishop of London commends the book, and he does well to commend it. Books of consolation are nothing, or they are almost everything. This one will give strength in the hour of weakness, because, above all else, it leads into the presence of Christ. The title which Mr. Foxell has chosen for it is *A Mirror of Divine Comfort* (Wells Gardner ; 2s. 6d. net).

The teaching of 'Divinity' is often accomplished most successfully by the Headmistresses of the great girls' schools. Very rarely, however, can a Headmistress give lectures in Divinity that will

stand publication. This gift is Miss Elizabeth Wordsworth's. Already we know well her lectures on the Decalogue. The new volume is a sequel. Taking the great commandments as known, Miss Wordsworth now insists upon the recognition of the smaller humanities of life—sympathy, patience, self-control, humility. There is the same intimacy with the Word and with the conscience; the same unconscious appeal: 'Be ye followers of me, even as I am of Christ.' The title of this book is *Onward Steps* (Wells Gardner ; 2s. 6d. net).

Messrs. Wells Gardner have also published *Spiritual Healing*, by the Rev. Robert C. L. Reade (1s. 6d. net); *The Cross, the Font, and the Altar*, by the Rev. H. T. Knight, M.A. (1s. 6d. net); and *The Handmaid of the Lord*, by the Rev. Hon. Cecil J. Littleton, M.A. (2s. net).

Mr. Burn has begun to issue the parts of *The Churchman's Pulpit* which deal with the Lord's Prayer. The first is Part 93 (Griffiths ; 1s. 6d. net). There are eighty very closely printed pages, yet only the invocation is touched.

Under the title of *Nature and Supernature* (Griffiths), the Rev. A. L. Lilley has published the sermons which he delivered in St. Mary's, Paddington Green, from Epiphany to Easter. They appear in groups. One group is entitled 'The Gifts of Epiphany,' another 'The Epic of Redemption,' another 'The Discipline of Nature,' and so on. Each group contains a varying number of sermons, all short, all thoughtful and demanding thought.

Two volumes have been added to Harper's 'Library of Living Thought.' The one is *The Birth of Worlds and Systems*, by Professor A. W. Bickerton (2s. 6d. net). The other is *Natural Christianity*, by the Hon. W. H. Fremantle, D.D., Dean of Ripon (2s. 6d. net).

Professor Bickerton's book is purely scientific; but in so being it will serve the preacher's purpose the better. For the preacher wants chiefly to know what pure science teaches regarding the origin of the Universe.

The Dean of Ripon is purely theological. His title is against him, and he knows it. So he hastens to say that he is not about to repeat Professor Seeley's mistake, or even to furnish an

abbreviated Gifford Lecture. His purpose is 'to draw out the fact that Christianity, being divine and supreme, must assert and work out its sovereign position by blending with human life, and with the general development of the whole system of nature which God has made.' Is it not, in short, a sequel to his book on *The Gospel of the Secular Life*? The dangers Dean Fremantle dreads are too much public worship and too much consequent clericalism.

To write out a list of books and other literature dealing with some subject seems to be the easiest thing in the world. It is one of the most difficult. Not one man in ten can copy a title accurately; not one in a hundred can tell where to begin with such a list and where to end. But a perfect specimen of bibliography is Peter Thomsen's *Die Palästina-Literatur*, the second volume of which has just appeared. The period covered by this volume is 1905 to 1909—five momentous years. And it is possible to say that not one article of value relating to Palestine, and not one book or pamphlet, has been omitted. And as the comprehensiveness, so the accuracy. We have used the first volume steadily throughout the last four years and now place absolute confidence in its entries. Ah, if other books of reference were like this!

The publishers are Messrs. Hinrichs of Leipzig, and the price is eight marks.

So long and so excellent was the review of Deissmann's *Light from the Ancient East*, contributed to THE EXPOSITORY TIMES by Principal Iverach, that we need do no more now than record the fact that a second edition has already been published and our very great pleasure thereat (Hodder & Stoughton; 16s. net). It does not appear that any change has been made.

It becomes a leader among the People called Methodists to give us a new exposition of the doctrine of the Holy Spirit. This leader is Professor W. T. Davison. The title of his book is *The Indwelling Spirit* (Hodder & Stoughton; 6s.).

Dr. Davison at once disclaims the intention of writing a systematic treatise on the Christian doctrine of the Holy Spirit. He says that all he hopes to do is to offer suggestions. But we wish some of our text-books had been as systematic, as

clear in their arrangement, as accurate in their language, as comprehensive in their outlook. Still, we accept his disclaimer. And we say that it is better to describe one or other of the great difficulties regarding the Spirit and enable us to see that clearly and make it our own, as Dr. Davison has done, for example, with the Spirit in Pauline psychology, than to offer us a dry system which professes to contain everything about the Spirit and is found to contain nothing.

A particularly suggestive chapter is that on 'the Tides of the Spirit.'

Archdeacon Moule has written his recollections of fifty years in China. It is a large volume that contains them, and no one will find it hard to read. The marvellously varied interest of China is well reflected in its pages. And the wonder grows, the wonder of its fascination with all its repulsiveness, not only with every book about China one reads, but almost with every chapter of every book. Certainly so natural, so unconscious, so picturesque a book as this compels the wonder with every chapter and even with every page. It is either all or nothing with China and the European. We either marvel that any one would go, or we marvel that any one can stay away.

Mr. Moule has, of course, the highest opinion of the Chinese intellect; and he has also the highest expectation of the Chinese future. But his interest is in the progress of the gospel. And there also his hopes and expectations are very high. He is strongly of opinion that we must give up the idea of westernizing China, whether in the interests of government or of religion. On the other hand, he is quite convinced that China needs radical change. Her life is rotten, the heart of it is rotten. A new life must enter, and that new life cannot be expressed more accurately than by saying that China must be born again.

The book contains a few good illustrations. Its title is *Half a Century in China* (Hodder & Stoughton; 7s. 6d. net).

There is no Church that can rival the Methodist in social interest. And it is so in America as well as here. A fine handsome volume has been edited by Mr. Harry F. Ward for the Methodist Federation for Social Service, and it has been published under the title of *Social Ministry* (Kelly; 3s. 6d. net). Twelve separate chapters

are written by twelve separate Methodists interested practically in social subjects. And, as is the way with the American, every statement is established or illustrated by incidents.

Messrs. P. Lethielleux of Paris issue a *Cursus Scripturae Sacrae*, under the editorship of the Jesuit scholars R. Cornely, J. Knabenbauer, and Fr. de Hummelauer, and under the benediction of Pope Pius x. The latest contribution is a Lexicon to the Greek New Testament. The first part, of 160 pages double column, extends to the middle of epsilon. The lexicon is thus to be smaller in size than Thayer. Is it not a little premature? The ostraca and papyri have not yet been sufficiently published. And unless they are taken full advantage of there seems no occasion for a new lexicon. Still they have been used so far as they are available, and it may be that students are unwilling to wait longer. The lexicon is in Latin. The author is Fr. Zorell, S.J.

Messrs. Sampson Low, Marston & Co. Ltd. have issued *The English Catalogue of Books* for 1910 (6s. net). As the volumes increase in number they grow in usefulness. There are now very few books published in English that are let slip; there are now very few errors of any kind in the entries. Trust a reviewer who has occasion to use the English Catalogue every day.

The Hulsean Lectures for 1910-1911 were delivered by the Rev. E. A. Edghill, B.D. They are now published under the title of *The Revelation of the Son of God* (Macmillan; 3s. net). Mr. Edghill has made the Christianity of the second century his special study. His purpose in the lectures is to tell us what that Christianity was. How did the second century Christian apprehend Christ? What effect had his Christianity on his life? And by what arguments did he commend the gospel to others?

Thus in one of the lectures Mr. Edghill treats of Christ the Lord. What did the Lordship of Christ signify to those who were so near to the Apostolic age and yet so far from the Apostolic authority? And how did they then commend that Lordship of Christ by their apologies?

All this is in the interest, not of historical study simply, but of the progress of the gospel in our day.

Ten years ago Mr. T. C. Hodson, being then Assistant Political Agent in Manipur and Superintendent of the State, collected materials about the Nāgas. After revision by himself and Col. Shakespear, he has now published a volume in which he gives a complete systematic account of that Indian tribe, their persons, their customs, their religion, and all else. The title is *The Nāga Tribes of Manipur* (Macmillan; 8s. 6d. net).

It is not the first work of the kind that Mr. Hodson has done, or that we have reviewed. He has the two necessary qualifications, intimate knowledge of the subject and skill in bookmaking. He is also interested particularly in Religion; and the religion of these Indian animistic tribes is undoubtedly the most important thing about them and the most worth recording. The account of Nāga religion occupies nearly half the volume. And, after all, he leaves a good deal to further investigation; for, of course, the last thing any savage will speak about is his religion. There is among these tribes a belief in two spirits, one of which is wise and the other foolish, and it is the constant struggle between the two that causes men to act so inconsistently. But how far the savage thus succeeds in shifting his moral responsibility off his own shoulders no man can yet tell.

One of the greatest difficulties in all these investigations is to distinguish what is native from what is imported; and that difficulty is increasing every day. Mr. Hodson has been most particular, and he has been just in time.

How difficult it is to find anything worth reading on the transcendence of God. Recent thinking has been all about His immanence. It is His love, not His sovereignty that has been the great attraction; it is His revelation in human experience, not His authority in Church or Word.

Accordingly Dr. J. R. Illingworth's new book on *Divine Transcendence* (Macmillan; 4s. 6d. net) supplies a serious want, the more serious that it is yet so little felt. It is too late in the day to discuss Dr. Illingworth's ability to do what is required. His previous volumes have established for him an almost unique reputation as a sound philosophical theologian. In this volume the ability is as evident as ever, and, more than that, the very things are discussed which most importunately cry out for discussion—the idea of being, relative and absolute, the working value of

our conception of personality, then transcendence as authority, and after that the idea of authority in all its manifestations, in the Church, the Sacraments, the Bible.

What does a Unitarian believe? Professor Ephraim Emerton of Harvard University has answered that question with perfect clearness and frankness in a book entitled *Unitarian Thought*, published by Messrs. Macmillan (6s. 6d. net). With clearness and frankness, and for both we thank him. No one should desire to maintain distinctions which do not exist; but it is a less evil so to do than to ignore distinctions which do exist. If a man does not believe in the deity of our Lord, it is a serious matter to credit him with that belief. And it does not become less serious when he explains that we are all deities together. Professor Emerton does not believe in the deity of Christ, and says so: 'Let it be clearly set down that Unitarians believe Jesus of Nazareth to have been a man like the rest of us.'

And not only so, but Professor Emerton is equally frank in stating that the unbelief in the deity of Christ carries results. One result is that to Unitarians the future life is an unsolved problem. 'Properly speaking, there is no such thing as a Unitarian doctrine of immortality.'

To the study of the social problem a book has been added by Dr. Scott Nearing of the University of Pennsylvania, under the title of *Social Adjustment* (Macmillan; 6s. 6d. net). Its topic, as its title indicates, is maladjustment. Now maladjustment is 'the failure to attain normality and harmony with the environment.' The book is accordingly written to prove three things: first, that maladjustment is prevalent in many forms; second, that in each of these forms it is remediable; and third, that adjustment is attainable only after maladjustment has been eliminated.

One of the maladjustments that have to be eliminated is the large family. It is being eliminated. 'In 1800 the large family was a commonplace; in 1900 it is an exception. Two generations ago a family of six children excited no comment; to-day the family of six is regarded with surprise.' It is being eliminated; but not fast enough for Dr. Nearing. For he holds that a low birth-rate provides the possibility of quality as

opposed to quantity, and ensures comparative freedom for women.

Truth in Religion (Macmillan; 4s. 6d. net) is a very general title, but it suits very well indeed the purpose which Mr. Dugald Macfadyen has before him. That purpose is to go to the very foundation of things and find out if there is anything in religion that can be accepted everywhere and by everybody as truth. The purpose is as timely as it is legitimate. For just at this present time the questions of doctrine are in the distance, theological hair-splitting having no attraction for the mind; the questions that are before us are those of the presence of God in the world and His demand for righteousness of life.

Mr. Macfadyen finds God easily. He easily admits God's demand that we should be holy as He is holy. Beyond that he goes one great step, and asks if we can be sure what that righteousness is which God demands of us. How are His commandments made known to us? By revelation or by reasoning? And then, What opportunity is afforded us of recovery if we have sinned and come short?

And so he ends with the Person of Christ—at once the revelation of God and the Redeemer of God's elect.

St. Matthew, in the series entitled 'The Bible for Home and School,' has been given to Professor A. T. Robertson of Louisville, and Professor Robertson has given himself to *St. Matthew* (Macmillan). It is the best work he has yet done. His ability in the modernizing of an ancient writing is very evident here—the days of the Son of Man are your days and mine.

The Rev. A. F. Mitchell, Vicar of St. Augustine's, Sheffield, is the editor of *Hebrews and the General Epistles*, in the 'Westminster New Testament' (Melrose; 2s. net). He uses his space to its utmost capacity, being able to distinguish the essential from the accidental, and he refers for further study to other commentaries on every important matter of discussion.

Messrs. Morgan & Scott have begun the issue of a popular series of books in evangelical religion. They are small quarto volumes in cloth, and the price is sixpence. *Tell Jesus* by Anna Shipton,

Robert Annan by the Rev. John Macpherson, and *Choice Sayings* (revised by R. C. Chapman) are familiar enough; but there are also three books by Mr. F. B. Meyer, *Present Tenses, Future Tenses*, and *Christian Living*.

Sermons that reach a third edition must be sermons of exception. Mr. Lushington's *Sermons to Young Boys* have done so (Murray; 3s. net). There is no condescension in them. The boys are men, capable of appreciating truth and of working righteousness.

For his Warburton Lectures Dean Wace has chosen the general title *Prophecy, Jewish and Christian* (Murray; 3s. 6d. net). The lectures are a recall. We are running away from that which is essential in Prophecy, that which makes it Prophecy, in our impatience with the supernatural and our eagerness to find ethical value in all things. The ethical element in Prophecy Dr. Wace does not deny. What he emphasizes is the religious element. It is not a nice calculation of probabilities; it is a 'Thus saith the Lord.'

Two things distinctly characterize the sermons contained in *A Broken Altar* (Nisbet; 3s. net). And they are good things, though not the best. The one is brevity; the other is literary interest. The Rev. Frederick Harper, M.A., Rector of Hinton, is a student of English literature, and his sermons gain greatly thereby. For there is no patching; all is good woven work from the top to the bottom.

The book of the month (excepting Moffatt's wonderful volume in the 'International Theological Library') is a symposium on *Non-Church-going* edited by Mr. W. Forbes Gray, and published by Messrs. Oliphant, Anderson, & Ferrier (3s. 6d. net). The writers of its chapters are in all cases men of distinguished ability and surpassing earnestness. And how urgent is the theme! It may be said that any man can *talk* about non-Church-going, and many men can talk cleverly, but who is to *do* anything? The answer is that these writers are actually doing something. And even if they were not, we must first see what cannot be done now, and then hear what can. But what are *we* doing?

Messrs. Passmore & Alabaster have now issued

the volume for 1910 of *The Metropolitan Tabernacle Pulpit* (7s. 6d.). It is volume the fifty-sixth. The sermons it contains were preached mostly in the seventies, some of them in the sixties. But they are rarely inspired by the circumstances of the time; they are so mightily inspired by the unchangeable Spirit of God that they can not only be read still, but are as profitable for reproof and for instruction as when they were delivered. The rare occasion of a local or temporary reference receives a footnote, so that the reader may not stumble or be at fault.

What are you looking for? *Pitman's Where to Look?* In any case, you will find it in that book. This is the fourth edition. But so useful is the book that it may be into the fifth before you have time to order it (Pitman; 2s. net).

Introducing his new book, which he calls *Gains and Losses* (Robert Scott; 1s. 6d. net), the Bishop of Edinburgh says: 'I remember Archbishop Benson telling us how, during the Lincoln Mission, a working man who was looking at a placard which announced the subject of some addresses as "The Four Last Things," was heard saying to another, "Where would you and I have been without Hell?"' And the Archbishop went on to ask whether we should not need a new motive power if the thought of "Hell" were banished from the Christian consciousness.' Dr. Walpole hopes that this new motive power may be found in the doctrine of the Resurrection Body. He has written this book to emphasize that doctrine.

Besides the three sermons on 'Christ bearing our burdens,' 'Bear ye one another's burdens,' and 'Every man shall bear his own burden,' there are many other expositions or exhortations, all touching the central theme of *Burden-Bearing*, by the Rev. John R. Palmer, a second edition of which has been published by Messrs. Seeley (5s.).

Mr. Fisher Unwin is issuing in this country the Tauchnitz Pocket Dictionaries. Here is Wessely's *English-German and German-English Dictionary* (2s. net). It is wonderful value for the money. And its handiness will give it the circulation its worth deserves.

From the Westminster Press there comes a small

volume with the striking title of *The Biblical Book*. It is an English translation of a work by Joachim M. Cullen of Buenos Ayres. At least it is the translation of the first part of that work. It consists of meditations and prayers. And the author hopes that Protestants as well as Roman Catholics will use his prayers, even those addressed to the Mother of God.

Mr. Walter Jekyll, M.A., has made selections, and translated them, from some of the principal writings of Schopenhauer, and he has published the whole of the selections in a single handsome

volume, under the title of *The Wisdom of Schopenhauer* (Watts; 6s. net). The selections are made apparently with the double purpose of making Schopenhauer better known, and of encouraging the purely ethical movement of our time.

The first purpose is fulfilled admirably. All that is of characteristic value in Schopenhauer will be found in this volume. The second purpose may be fulfilled also. In any case, it is very likely that this easy translation will give the ideas of Schopenhauer a circulation which they have never had. And it will be chiefly among those who are interested in the Ethical Societies.

Identification of an unnamed Old Testament King.

By P. S. P. HANDCOCK, B.A., ASSISTANT IN DEPARTMENT OF EGYPTIAN AND ASSYRIAN ANTIQUITIES, BRITISH MUSEUM.

THE kings of Damascus, Syria's once famous capital, were influential factors in Palestinian politics throughout the whole period of Old Testament history; from the very necessity involved in their geographical position, their fortunes alternately coincided and collided with those of the smaller kingdoms of those of Israel and Judah, whom they endeavoured with varying success to play off against each other. In accordance with this policy of preserving the balance of power, Benhadad, king of Syria, lent his support to Asa, king of Judah, against Baasha, king of Israel (1 K 15-18 ff.), the result of which was disastrous, so far as Israel was concerned, and meant the loss of a number of cities in the Galilee district to the northern kingdom; while later, in pursuance of the same policy, Rezin of Damascus took the field with Pekah of Israel against Ahaz, king of Judah, which move had the effect of sending Ahaz headlong into the arms of the Assyrian colossus, the price of whose help was the practical as well as the theoretical acknowledgment of his suzerainty. But the reign of the unnamed king of Syria who is the principal figure in 1 K 22 took place between these two periods, i.e. about the middle of the ninth century B.C.

Mr. Luckenbill, one of the ablest of the younger school of Assyriologists, has shown in an article to be published in the *American Journal of Semitic*

Languages, of which the present writer has seen the manuscript and proofs, the extreme improbability, if not the actual impossibility, of the generally accepted identification of Benhadad, Ahab's contemporary, and the so-called 'Bir-idri' of Shalmaneser's inscription in which that king specifically mentions Ahab as one of the vassal kings in the opposing army of 'Bir-idri,' king of Syria, whose name we shall presently see should be transcribed 'Adad-idri.' The combined forces of this king Shalmaneser professes to have routed at Karkar, though the fact that he entirely failed to follow up his alleged victory makes one very suspicious of the truth of his statement; while the positive result of Mr. Luckenbill's investigation has been the practically certain discovery of another king of Syria whom we must identify with the unnamed king of Syria in 1 K 22, a king indeed already known under the incorrect name 'Bir-idri,' but a king entirely different from the Benhadad whom Ahab successfully defeated twice, and from whom he received the cities taken by that king's father from Ahab's father Omri.

BENHADAD AND 'BIR-IDRI.'

It is a well-known fact that Benhadad, the name of the king of Syria mentioned in 1 K 20 as Ahab's contemporary, differs from the name of the king of Syria mentioned by Shalmaneser, who

also was a contemporary, and according to Shalmaneser a suzerain of Ahab.

The only king of Syria of Ahab's time whose name is actually given in the Old Testament is a certain Benhadad, while the name of the king given by Shalmaneser has been transcribed by scholars as *Bir-idri* ('*ilu* IM-*idri*').

This transcription owes its origin entirely to an attempt to identify the king mentioned by Shalmaneser with the Biblical Benhadad of 1 K 20, who has been quite gratuitously identified with the unnamed king of Syria of 1 K 22.

Undoubtedly, the unnamed king of Syria in 1 K 22, at whose hands Ahab met his death, is one and the same personage as the king of Shalmaneser's inscription, to whom Ahab, prior to his unsuccessful revolt, had been subject, and at whose behests he was compelled to accompany his overlord in the latter's apparently successful attempt to withstand the repeated onslaughts of the Assyrians; but the two other identifications of (1) the Benhadad, king of Syria, whom Ahab twice defeated, and who escaped with his life the second time purely as the result of Ahab's unseasonable clemency (1 K 20), with the unnamed king of Syria in 1 K 22, who completely vanquished Ahab, and (2) the identification of the Benhadad of 1 K 20 with the apparently all-powerful king of Syria mentioned by Shalmaneser, are both highly improbable, and are both alike based on the assumption that Ahab during his reign of twenty-two years can have only known one king of Syria, and that consequently all kings of Syria referred to as having any dealing with Ahab, whether in the cuneiform inscriptions or in the Old Testament, are necessarily one and the same individual; hence philologists have been at great pains to adequately account for the difference in the names given in cuneiform on the one hand, and Hebrew on the other, for this king of Syria whose reign coincided roughly with the reign of Ahab. They have accordingly mustered up all the philological possibilities at their disposal in their endeavour to show that the '*ilu* IM-*idri*' is the cuneiform equivalent for Benhadad.

An examination of the two names will demonstrate the arbitrariness of seeking to identify them, while the improbability of the identification of the comparatively powerless Benhadad of 1 K 20 on the one hand, and the powerful unnamed king of 1 K 22, whose power is similarly attested by Shal-

maneser's inscription, on the other, has already been shown. In short, historic probability is against the generally-accepted identification of the two kings, while philologically the theory that the cuneiform '*ilu* IM-*idri*' = Benhadad is shown by Luckenbill to be untenable.

'Benhadad' of course = son of Adad, the regular name for the storm-god, the ordinary cuneiform sign for this god being—'IM'; substituting its normal value in the name '*ilu* IM-*idri*', we get '*ilu* Adad-*idri*'; the second element in this compound name *idri* = 'my helper,' the Aramaic root '*adaru*', being equivalent to the Hebrew '*azaru*, *z* and *d* regularly interchanging. This *idri* is now known as an element of many Mesopotamian personal names of the eighth and seventh centuries B.C. Now the '-ezer' in the Biblical name of 'Hadad-ezer' comes from this same Semitic root = 'to help,' thus we have in *Adad-idri* the cuneiform equivalent of the Hebrew *Hadad-ezer*, though it should be mentioned that the Biblical Hadad-ezer, king of Zobah, lived in the time of David and therefore long before the period with which we are dealing. To this '*ilu* IM-*idri*' Luckenbill gives its normal transcription—*Adad-idri*, a transcription which, apart from the anxiety to identify the name with Benhadad, would have been that given by all scholars, but the tacit assumption of the identity of the two kings—'Benhadad' and '*ilu* IM-*idri*' has evoked the very ingenious and the hitherto generally accepted reading '*ilu* Bir-*idri*', the *Bir* without the ordinary determinative *ilu* (=god) being attenuated from *Bar*, the Aramaic equivalent of the Hebrew *Ben* = 'son'; the *idri* and *Hadad* were reconciled on the theory that here, as so often elsewhere, the *r* and *d*, which are both very similar in Hebrew and Aramaic writing, have been confused, hence the apparent discrepancy between the latter parts of these two names—the *-idri* and the *-hadad*: such might be a satisfactory argument on behalf of the identity of the two names, but the very dubious transcription of the cuneiform '*ilu* IM' as *Bir*, and the implied assumption thereby of the existence of a West Semitic god of that name, whose name was thus identical with the Aramaic word for 'son' (= Hebrew *Ben*), which latter assumption, indeed, may or may not find justification in the existence of such names as *Bar-rekub*, *Bar-sur*, etc., in the Senjirli inscriptions, yet the uncertainty as to the existence of such a god, and the extreme improbability of the transcription *Bir* for *IM*, for it is

purely conjectural, together with the fact that in the gods' lists in which are given the different names by which the deities were known, and the foreign gods with whom they were identified, *Bir* does not occur as the equivalent of the god 'ilu IM,'—although the latter is identified with some sixty names among which are enumerated *Addu* and *Dadu*, accompanied with an explanatory note to the effect that he is known under these names in 'Amurru,' *i.e.* Syria-Palestine—as also the historic improbability of the identification which the theory seeks to establish, dispose of the reading *Bir* for IM. And as the IM cannot be transcribed *Bir*, the only argument which has been brought forward by scholars for the identification of the all-important first part of 'ilu IM-idri' with the first part of the Biblical Ben-hadad is at once shattered. The 'ilu IM-idri' who holds his own against the attacks of Shalmaneser II., and to whom, as we learn from the latter's monuments, Ahab owed allegiance, is not to be equated with the Benhadad of 1 K 20, and thus the only reason for giving the 'ilu IM-idri' a forced transcription no longer exists, and we are able to transcribe the first element in this name in the normal manner, *i.e.* by 'Adad,' the whole name 'ilu Adad-idri'

being the exact equivalent of the Hebrew 'Hadad-ezer.'

Accordingly the king of Syria in 1 K 22, by whom Ahab was defeated and slain at Ramoth-gilead is Hadad-ezer, an entirely different personage from the comparatively impotent Benhadad of 1 K 20.

But one other point remains to be cleared up, and that is, with whom is the Benhadad, king of Syria, who besieged Samaria (2 K 6) in the reign of Jehoram, king of Israel, the second successor of Ahab, to be identified? With this point Luckenbill does not deal, but either the writer of 2 K 6 has given us the wrong name of the king of Syria in question, for Adad-idri succeeded the Benhadad of 1 K 20, some time before Ahab's death, and long before Jehoram's reign, or else another Benhadad came to the throne between Adad-idri and the usurper Hazael. But however that may be, Luckenbill has successfully established the identity of the unnamed king in 1 K 22, and we now know that Ahab had dealings with at least two kings of Syria, and not merely one, as had hitherto been supposed. Thus it is that philology comes to the aid of archaeology, and is at times of even greater value to the historian of antiquity than the pottery of ruined mounds and the treasures of buried tombs.

Recent Foreign Theology.

Wendland on the Miracles.¹

PROFESSOR WENDLAND has produced the book on miracles for which many of us have been waiting. To name a treatment of the subject at once positive, modern, and intelligent, has for some time been difficult; if we had the present work in English it would be difficult no longer. Not that the line taken is wholly original; what is original is rather the quiet reasonableness and open-eyed knowledge with which a large number of wholesome ideas are systematically and convincingly expounded. Pope's line recurs:

What oft was thought, but ne'er so well expressed.

Wendland writes with buoyancy, his command of the subject is impressive, and, what is still more

valuable, he is careful to bring out at each point the religious significance of the issues. As he puts it on the first page, faith in miracle is simply faith in the living God. The *living* God—not one who cannot or will not act in the world, or one who acts by iron necessity. Hence the definition: 'Miracles are acts of God producing a new condition of things not already latent in the existing texture of the world' (p. 8). One of the excellences in Wendland's position is that he distinctly rejects the old (Thomistic) view of miracle as contrary to the laws of nature. It is pure mythology to suppose that the course of events is subject to 'immutable laws.' So far from that, God, just because He is alive, is perpetually and creatively active in the phenomenal sphere. Doubtless there would be a contravention of the world-order if we were entitled to think of the ideas of 'natural laws' and 'the causal nexus' either as metaphysically valid in the ultimate sense

¹ *Der Wunderglaube im Christentum.* Von Johannes Wendland, Professor der Theologie in Basel. Göttingen: Vandenhoeck und Ruprecht, 1910, pp. 134. Price M.3.

or as exhaustive descriptions of reality. But this is just what they are not. Reality has other aspects, and these the categories of science and history can never apprehend. The strict equivalence of cause and effect is an unproved and unprovable dogma; so is the notion that nature is a closed mechanical system; the only legitimate principle of causality is that every event has a cause, and, in perfect harmony with that principle, we are justified in holding it to be always possible that God may open a new future, pouring into the world new streams of life and energy, and so rearranging even physical forces as to bring out new results. We must not confine His action to the physical order, much less put the physical order in His place. For God is transcendent as well as immanent, and 'no one form of divine operation is more direct than another.' On the contrary, the world is in living relation to Him; and miracles are but the product or expression within the phenomenal realm of His transcendent being. Nothing could be better than the passage in which Wendland replies to the familiar argument that miraculous action would be on God's part an impeachment of the unchangeable world-order He had Himself established. This plainly assumes that such an unchangeable order exists: but what if there is no such thing? And that there is no such thing is really presupposed in every view of human history which regards it as more than clock-work running down. In sober truth, reality is richer far than this. At every moment the condition of the universe admits of an infinity of possibilities in the future. And the demand of Christian faith in miracle, as Professor Wendland puts it, 'is at bottom that new beginnings occur, not springing of necessity from the previous state of the world. This contradicts no axiom of science, no law of thought.'

The writer sees with perfect clearness that it is futile to limit miracles to the past. He meets the statement 'Miracles do not happen now' with a direct negative. And he disposes of the notion that they occur only in the sphere of mind. It is impossible to split the one world in two with a hatchet. Faith is needed to perceive the reality of miracle, but—here his good sense comes out—it is illegitimate to insist on the recognition of the miraculous by either science or history. All they can say is: *Non liquet*, and their duty is to say it. Another point made very incisively is that Providence is inconceivable apart from

miracle. Any other view really amounts to describing God and His government of the world in purely impersonal terms; which is what always happens when the mechanical order is interposed between God and us, or when the 'natural laws,' which for special scientific purposes we have abstracted from the multiplicity of phenomena, are interpreted as being a *full* expression of the Divine will. It is meaningless to speak of God as ruling all things, except as we believe in the possibility of incessant new departures. New departures do not shatter the historical nexus; they enrich it. All this has, of course, a vital bearing on the question of prayer. Prayer does not change God, but it changes His operation by furnishing the necessary antecedent condition of His action. And the notion that the hearing of prayer is implicitly a disturbance of God's plan is defensible only—here we come back to basal principles—if the present condition of the cosmos is a perfect expression, a completely satisfactory manifestation, of the purpose of Eternal Love.

Wendland gives us principles; he does comparatively little in the way of applying them to the Bible narrative of specific miraculous events. Obviously, except where men hold verbal inspiration, there will always be considerable variety of exegetical opinion as to particulars. We may quote, however, his conclusions as to the resurrection of Jesus Christ. 'Questions of detail,' he writes, 'as to the mode and manner in which Jesus could manifest Himself to the disciples, must remain in shadow; for the supersensible will always evade exact investigation. But a real fact is at the basis of the appearances. Historical research may go no further than to ascertain the fact of visions. That they were not purely subjective visions, but the product of a transcendent reality,—this is the interpretation of faith; but it is an interpretation which is both right and inevitable.'

H. R. MACKINTOSH.

New College, Edinburgh.

¶ Theological Survey.¹

DR. IHMELS of Leipzig is fast winning his way to a place in the front rank of present-day German

¹ *Centralfragen der Dogmatik in der Gegenwart.* Sechs Vorlesungen, von D. Ludwig Ihmels. Leipzig: Deichert, 1911. M.3.80.

theologians. His style is the most simple and terse of any that we know. Committed to no one school, he is a conservative eclectic in the best sense. His elaborate treatise *Die christliche Wahrheitsgewissheit, ihr letzter Grund und ihre Entstehung*, now in a second improved edition, is a searching discussion of a burning question. Its exposition and defence of the Protestant position is conclusive. The briefer work mentioned below is equally excellent. The six lectures, delivered to school teachers at the suggestion of the Saxon Ministry of Education, discuss the trend of German thought at present on the central points of Christian faith. The work is a companion to a work on similar lines by Professor Kittel on O.T. religion which has appeared in an English dress. The questions discussed are truly central—the cry for Undogmatic Christianity, the Nature and Absoluteness of Christianity, the Nature of Revelation, the Person of Jesus, the Work of Jesus, the Certitude of Faith. Current views on these subjects are stated and criticised both in their truth and defects. In this way the position taken by Ritschl, Kaftan, Troeltsch, Dreyer, and especially the influence of Schleiermacher, are set in relation to the author's own views. Dr. Ihmels keeps the dis-

cussion within manageable dimensions by resolutely ignoring side issues and subordinate details. He points out that the protest made against dogma in religion is sometimes against all dogma, and sometimes simply against the traditional dogma of the Church, and has no difficulty in showing that if religion is essentially faith in God, knowledge and dogma are inevitable, and, again, that the dogma coming down from early days relates to facts of redemption in which the Reformation made no material change. The most valuable chapter, perhaps, is the last one, on Christian Certainty. It is conceded at once that religious judgments are judgments of faith, not of science in the strict sense, and so subjectivism to a certain extent belongs to them: but the same is true on all subjects outside the sphere of demonstration. In the last resort the security of Christian faith is rooted in the fact of experience. After discussing Kaftan's and Troeltsch's teaching on the question, the author finally accepts Frank's way of stating the truth as the most satisfactory. The notes appended at the end of the work amount to a substantial addition to the lectures, and the references to other writers are very helpful.

J. S. BANKS.

Leeds.

Contributions and Comments.

Selah as 'Reverential Prostration.'

At the end of the article on 'Temple and Temple-service' in Cheyne-Black's *Encyclopædia Biblica* (col. 4955, below) Rev. G. H. Box states that the choir of Levites, to the accompaniment of instrumental music, sang the psalm of the day, which was divided into three sections; at the close of each section a body of priests¹ blew three blasts on the silver trumpets, and the people prostrated themselves in worship; the singing of the psalm closed the morning service, and the private sacrifices were proceeded with.²

I read this article for the first time on December 8, 1910, and it occurred to me at once that this prostration during the psalmody at the close of the morning service might be indicated by the Biblical *Selah*. I have since found (by looking up the references under *Selah* in the new edition of

Gesenius' Heb. lexicon) that this explanation was suggested fourteen years ago by B. Jacob, of Göttingen, in Stade's *Zeitschrift für die alttestamentliche Wissenschaft*, vol. xvi. (Giessen, 1896) p. 139 (cf. *ibid.*, pp. 144 and 170).³

At the end of his valuable paper, Dr. Jacob states that the etymology of *Selah* is unknown. I believe, however, that *Selah* is connected with the Heb. verb *salál*, which means originally *to throw*. The noun *selah* denotes *throwing down, prostration in adoration*. This is practically the explanation suggested by Hitzig in his commentary on the Psalms (Leipzig, 1863), p. 15. Hitzig, however, combined *Selah* with Arab. *qallâ* (Assyr. *qullâ*), to pray, which is impossible. The original meaning of *qallâ*, to pray, is *to cause to incline* (the ear).⁴ Syr. *qelâ* means *to incline*, the reflexive *iqfēlî* denotes *to bend*. In Ethiopic, *qalâwa* means *to incline* (the ear), and *qallâya* denotes *to pray*. The noun *qalît*,

prayer, shows that the last stem-consonant was originally a *w*, not *y*.

Hitzig believed that *Selah* had the connotation of Arab. *rák'ah*, bowing in prayer.⁵ Arab. *rák'ah*, however, does not mean *prostration*; the phrase *rükū' fi-ṣ-ṣalāt*, bowing in prayer, denotes the bowing of a worshipper in such a way that the palms of his hands reach his knees, and that, if a cup full of water be placed upon his back, it will not be spilled. The Arabic term for *prostration* is *sájdhah*. Arab. *sájada* is the stem from which *másjid*, mosque, lit. *place of prostration or worship* is derived.⁶ The Assyrian equivalent is *šukénū* with the participle *muškénū*, grovelling, mean, low, Heb. *miskén*, which has passed into French as *mesquin*.⁷ Arab. *sájada* means to *prostrate oneself* in prayer by dropping gently upon the knees, placing the palms of the hands on the ground, a little before the knees, and then putting the nose and forehead on the ground, the former first, between the two hands; see Lane's Arabic lexicon, under *rdka'a* and *sájada*; cf. the illustrations on p. lxiv of the fifth German edition of Baedeker's *Egypt* (Leipzig, 1902).

Heb. *selah* is synonymous with Arab. *sájdhah*, Syr. *sigdēhū*, Heb. *sígídāh* or *hištahwayāh*.⁸ *Selah* stands for *sálah*, *sállah*, which is the accusative of *sall*, an intransitive infinitive of *salál*, to throw.⁹ The accusative is used in commands and exclamations; cf. Arab. *áhlan wa-sáhlan*, welcome! or *qábran*, patience! or *máhlan*, easy! and Heb. *halílah*, far be it! (cf. Arab. *ma'ádha 'lláhi*, God forbid!), or *'ezráthah*, help! (French *au secours!* German *Hilfe!* cf. German *Ruhe!* *Mut!* *Geduld!* and our *silence!* etc.).¹⁰ *Selah* means, therefore, *prostration!*¹¹

We need not suppose that *Selah* has the vowels of *néqah*, *perpetuity*.¹² *Selah* stands for *sálah*, *sállah*, just as we have *hérāh*, to the mountain (Gn 14¹⁰) for *hárāh*, *hárrah*, and *Paddénah* (Gn 28^{2. 5. 6. 7}) for *Paddánah*.¹³ Similarly we have in Syriac, *géra*, arrow, for *gára*, *gárrá*; and in Assyrian, *zéru*, seed, for *zárū*, *zarrú*, *zar'u*, *zar'u*.¹⁴

The Heb. stem *salál* is used in the sense of *throwing up*, *casting up* (a highway or a mound).¹⁵ Heb. *mésillāh*, highway (also *maslál*) means originally *casting up*. This is the primary meaning also of Heb. *sólélāh*, mound (cast up by besiegers). For Heb. *mésillāh* we have in Assyrian, *sulū*, more accurately *sullū*, which means originally something *cast up*;¹⁶ the Assyrian equivalent of Heb. *sólélāh*,

mound, is *sellu*, *sillu* (which may stand for *sil'u*, *silyu*). Assyr. *sillatu*, baseness, vileness, means originally *abjectness* (German *Verworfenheit*). The Assyrian verb *salú* denotes to *throw off* (the yoke, etc.).¹⁷

The Heb. verb *saláh* (Ps 119¹¹⁸, Lam 1¹⁵) means to *throw away*, *cast off*, *reject*. In Syriac, *séla* has the same meaning, e.g. *képha dě-aslú* *bannáye*, the stone which the builders rejected (Ps 118²²).¹⁸ In Arabic, *sálá*, *yásłá* (or *sáliya*, *yásłá*), means to *console oneself about the loss of a thing*, to *get over it*, *forget it*;¹⁹ but the primary meaning is to *throw it off*; cf. *our dismiss*, which means originally to *send away*, then to *discard*, *reject*, *put away*, *put out of mind*. In Hebrew, the phrase to *cast behind one's back* means to *throw over* = to *desert*, *abandon*, *neglect*; cf. Ezk 23³⁵, 1 K 14⁹, Ps 50¹⁷, Neh 9²⁶. This may mean to *forget and forgive*; cf. Is 38¹⁷.

The Assyrian verb *sullū*, which is generally supposed to mean to *pray*, means originally to *throw*, namely, to *throw oneself down* in humility and adoration. According to the cuneiform vocabularies, *sullū* is synonymous with *labán appi*, *prostration of the face*. Heb. *selah* was compared with Assyr. *sullū* and *teslītu*,²⁰ *prayer*, by Dr. Muss-Arnolt in the *Johns Hopkins University Circulars*, No. 81 (May 1890), p. 76. But *Selah* does not mean *prayer*;²¹ it denotes *prostration*, and this is the meaning also of Assyr. *sullū* and *teslītu*.

Heb. *sóllū la-rókhév ba-'avóth* (not *ba-'aravóth!*) in Ps 68⁵ means *Fall down to Him who rides on the clouds*, *prostrate yourselves before Him*.²² *Salál* may be construed with *lē*, just as Aramaic *ségid* and Arabic *sájada* (syn. *xáda'a taṭámaṇa wa-tawáda'a*) are construed with *lē*; cf. Dn 2⁴⁶ (*u-lē-Daniyél ségid*) and Syr. *ségid lē-Máryā*, he worshipped the Lord (also Greek *hypopíptein*, *prospíptein*, or *prokylindesthaí tini*). Even Heb. *hódū lē-Yahwéh* may mean originally *throw yourselves down for Yahweh*, *fall down to Yahweh*; cf. *sagád* in Is 44^{15. 17. 19} 46⁶. *Hódū* may be connected with *yadáh* (and *yadád*), to *throw*. *Hithwaddáh*, to *confess*, means originally to *throw oneself* (upon the mercy of the court, etc.). Stems *mediæ geminate* often have byforms *tertiae w* and *y*: just as we have *yadád* and *yadáh*, or *salál* and *saláh*, so we find in Assyrian, *garáru*, to *run*, *šaráru*, to *shine*, for Arab. *járā*, *šáriya*;²³ and instead of Heb. *kol* (for *kull*), we have in Assyrian *kalū* (*tertiae w* or *y*).²⁴

I believe, therefore, that *Selah* stands for *sâlah*, *sâllâh*, from *salâl*, to throw. It means originally *throwing down, prostration*, and indicates the passages in the Psalms where the priests blew the trumpets bidding the worshippers to prostrate themselves in adoration. These prostrations took place at the end of a section; therefore *Selah* is found, as a rule, at the end of a stanza. But in the received text it has often been omitted or misplaced.²⁵

Selah is found (1) once in 16 Psalms (7. 20. 21. 44. 47. 48. 50. 54. 60. 61. 75. 81. 82. 83. 85. 143); (2) twice in 15 Psalms (4. 9. 24. 39. 49. 52. 55. 57. 59. 62. 67. 76. 84. 87. 88); (3) thrice in 7 Psalms (3. 32. 46. 66. 68. 77. 140)²⁶ and in the third chapter of Habakkuk; (4) four times in 1 Psalm (89). It occurs also in Jewish prayers, but there it is used, as a rule, in the sense of *forever* = (*la-*) *nêçâh*. This is the meaning of the word according to Jewish tradition. The Targum renders *Selah* by *le-'âlémîn*, forever, and the Talmud (*Erubin*, 54^a) states: *kol mèqôm še-nêmár nêçâh, sêlah, wa'-éd, ên lô hephség 'ôlamith*; wherever *nêçâh*, *sêlah*, and *wa'-éd* are used (in the Scripture) they mean that it (*i.e.* the action referred to) must never cease (*lit. there is no cessation to it forever*).

The Greek equivalent of **Selah* would be *proskynesis*; the Septuagintal rendering *diápsalma*, which is found also in two (17⁸¹ 18¹⁰) of the so-called Psalms of Solomon, seems to denote, not *interlude*, but *intermission* between two sections of a Psalm.

NOTES.

(1) More correctly, *two priests* (*šenê kôhanîm*).

(2) See *Tamid* 66^b; the Hebrew text is quoted in Graetz's commentary on the Psalms (Breslau, 1883), p. 55 (*Selah* is discussed *ibid.* p. 93). Cf. also 2 Ch 29²⁶⁻³⁰; || Sir 50^{16. 17}; E. Schürer, *Geschichte des jüdischen Volkes im Zeitalter Jesu Christi*, vol. ii. fourth edition (Leipzig, 1907), pp. 350 and 355; Miss E. G. Briggs' paper on *Selah* in the *American Journal of Semitic Languages*, vol. xvi. (Chicago, 1899) p. 17.

(3) In his new Heb. dictionary (Leipzig, 1910) Professor Eduard König, of Bonn, adheres to Ewald's explanation *louder*. The new (fifteenth) edition of Gesenius' Heb. lexicon (Leipzig, 1910) states p. 539, *Die Bedeutung und Etymologie des Wortes ist ganz dunkel*.

(4) Contrast note 106 to my paper on Babylonian elements in the Levitic ritual, *Journal of the Society*

of Biblical Literature

, vol. xix. p. 78. Heb. *hillâh*, to implore, means originally to sicken, pester, trouble, weary.

(5) Arab. *râka'a* is a transposed doublet of *kâra'a* = Heb. *kard'*; see the article on Gideon's water-lappers in the *Journal of the American Oriental Society*, vol. xxii. p. 73. For transposed doublets see Haupt, *The Book of Micah* (Chicago, 1910), p. 103, last note on ii; cf. the *American Journal of Semitic Languages*, vol. xxvi. p. 239 and p. 3, § 2.

(6) According to Dr. Ember, *sagâd* is a causative of the root *qad* which we have in Heb. *qaddâd* = Assyr. *quddudu*, to bow; cf. the *American Journal of Semitic Languages*, vol. xxvi. p. 234, end of first paragraph; vol. xxvii. p. 213, line 9.

(7) See my paper on Xenophon's account of the fall of Nineveh, in the *Journal of the American Oriental Society*, vol. xxviii. p. 103, note 2, and my remarks in the *American Journal of Semitic Languages*, vol. xxvi. p. 20, note 7.

(8) Cf. the Talmudic *kêrî'ôth wě-hištañwayôth*, genuflexions and prostrations, *Ber.* 31^a (in L. Goldschmidt's edition, vol. i. p. 114, line 11).

(9) Similarly *çar* in *ba-çâr-lî*, in my distress, is an intransitive infinitive of *çarâr*. In *ba-çârâthah-lî* (Ps 120¹) we have the locative of the feminine intransitive infinitive; contrast Gesenius' grammar, § 144, b, note 1. For the connexion of *Mîçrâdîm* with this stem, and the etymology of the name *Egypt*, see the eighth page of my paper on *Adar* and *Elul* in the *Zeitschrift der Deutschen Morgenländischen Gesellschaft*, vol. lxiv. part 4.

(10) See Gesenius' Heb. grammar, § 67, p., § 90, f.g.h.; Wright — De Goeje's Arabic grammar, vol. ii. p. 73, D.

(11) Cf. the liturgical directions in John Chrysostom's eucharistic sermon published in Dillmann's Ethiopic chrestomathy, p. 53, below.

(12) Contrast Dr. Jacob's paper, p. 173, and Miss Briggs' article, p. 28.

(13) See Haupt, *The Book of Micah* (Chicago, 1910), p. 90, note*.

(14) Cf. Syr. *hêre*, freemen, for *hâre*, *hârrê*, etc. See Nöldeke's Syriac grammar, § 14, C, and my contributions to Assyrian phonology, in the Proceedings of the Royal Society of Göttingen, April 25, 1883, p. 90; also my *Assyrian E-vowel* (Baltimore, 1887) p. 20.

(15) Cf. Gn 31⁵¹: Behold this heap which I have cast betwixt me and thee (Heb. *hinnéh ha-gâl ha-*

zēh ḫšér yarīthi bēnī u-vēnēkha). To cast may mean to form by throwing up earth, to raise; also to throw off, to reject. For Gn 31⁵¹, cf. Eduard Meyer, *Die Israeliten und ihre Nachbarstämme* (Halle, 1906), pp. 245, 277, 286.

(16) The Sumerian word for street is *sil*; but we need not suppose that Assyr. *sullū* is a Sumerian loanword.

(17) Cf. Heb. *hišlīkh* in Ps 2⁸; see the translation of this hymn in the *Johns Hopkins University Circulars*, No. 163, p. 91.

(18) For the meaning of this phrase, cf. Haupt, *The Book of Micah* (Chicago, 1910), p. 44, note 6, and p. 51, note 30.

(19) Contrast Est 2¹ and the remarks in Haupt *The Book of Esther* (Chicago, 1908), p. 18. A synonym of *sāliya* is *lāhiya*; cf. Ethiopic *alhāya*, to solace, and my paper on *Bēnē Le'āh* and *Bēnē Rahēl*, i.e. cowboys and sheepmen in the *Zeitschrift für die alttestamentliche Wissenschaft*, vol. xxix. p. 282, line 9.

(20) Both *sullū* and *teslītu* are infinitive forms of the Piel; see Delitzsch and Haupt, *Beiträge zur Assyriologie*, vol. i. (Leipzig, 1890) p. 38.

(21) Cf. *qa=qałot*, prayer, in Dillmann's Ethiopic chrestomathy, pp. 55 and 56, below; see above, note 11.

(22) Saadya renders: *wa'-áxliqū li-sākini 'l-ghuyūmi*, worship Him who dwells in the clouds. Cf. my explanation of Ps 68 in the *American Journal of Semitic Languages*, vol. xxiii. p. 225, note 5.

(23) *Muggarîm* in Mic 1⁴ is not derived from *garár*, to run, as suggested by Wellhausen, but from *magár*, to fall; see Haupt, *The Book of Micah* (Chicago, 1910), p. 58, note*; p. 239, ii.

(24) See my paper on the Heb. stem *nahál*, to rest, in the *American Journal of Semitic Languages*, vol. xxii. p. 265 below, and my paper on the roots *gr*, *kr*, *xr* in vol. xxiii. p. 252.

(25) Cf., e.g., my restoration of the Maccabean psalms 4. 68. 76 in the *American Journal of Semitic Languages*, vol. xxvi. p. 22; vol. xxiii. pp. 222-224; *Zeitschrift der Deutschen Morgenländischen Gesellschaft*, vol. lxi. p. 287.

(26) Dr. Peters' suggestion (*Journal of Biblical Literature*, vol. xxix. pp. 121, 125) that *Selah* in Ps 3 indicates the refrain, is untenable.

PAUL HAUPT.

Baltimore, Md.

Symmachus, not Aquila.

UNDER the title 'Un nouveau fragment de la version grecque du Vieux Testament par Aquila' there have been published by Charles Wessely of Vienna, in the *Mélanges Chatelain* (Paris, 1910, p. 224 ff.), two scraps of vellum, said to belong to the third or fourth century, containing fragments of Ps. 68 and 80 (in the Greek numbering). 'As in other MSS of Aquila, the Divine Name is written in the old Hebrew characters.' So says F. G. Kenyon, in the *Egypt Exploration Fund's Archaeological Report for 1909-1910*, p. 45, and it is worth while to state that the version is not Aquila's, but that of Symmachus, as a look into Field's edition of the Hexapla would have shown at once to the editor of these fragments. But they are therefore the more interesting. For they prove that Symmachus also—or was it Origen?—employed the old Hebrew characters for the Divine Name.

EB. NESTLE.

Maulbronn.



A Revision of the Revised Version?

I HAVE been much interested in the article entitled 'Sketches in Pauline Vocabulary,' by the Rev. R. Martin Pope, in the April number of THE EXPOSITORY TIMES, but my object in writing is to refer to the footnote on p. 312 and to ask a question which some of your contributors may be able to answer.

In the footnote Mr. Pope says that the R.V. reverses the translation of the A.V., giving 'power' for *δύναμις* in the earlier part of the verse, and 'strength' in the later.

I was reading the article with the 'Interlinear Bible' by my side, and on referring to it, discovered to my astonishment that in it *δύναμις* is translated 'power' in both parts of the verse (R.V.). I wondered if Mr. Pope were unjustly adding to the criticism of that much-criticised version; but on turning up the New Testament (R.V.), published in 1881, and 'The Holy Bible' (R.V.), published in 1885, I found that both gave the translation as Mr. Pope says, i.e. 'power' to begin with, and 'strength' later. Therefore, the 'Interlinear Bible' has revised the Revised Version at least to that extent. I searched the various prefaces of the 'Interlinear Bible' for any indication of such a revision, but found

none. The question I wish to ask is, if there are other examples of such double revisions, and if so, by whose authority they are made?

JOHN M. DICKIE.

The Manse, Wick.

Which was the Night of the Passover?

IT has always been felt by commentators, as well as by every thoughtful reader, that it is most difficult to decide whether the Thursday night, when our Lord kept the Passover feast with His disciples, according to the Synoptists, was really the time of the Passover; or whether it was Friday evening, after the Crucifixion was over, as implied by St. John in 18²⁸. My own mind has so often swayed between these two theories, that it was a happy surprise when I came across the following passage in the *Jewish Encyclopædia* (published in 1904), giving as a solution the fact that the Passover happened to fall in that year on a Sabbath.

'Chwolson (*Das Letzte Passamahl Christi*, St. Petersburg, 1893) has ingeniously suggested that the priests were guided by the older Halakah, according to which the law of the Passover was regarded as superior to that of the Sabbath, so that the lamb could be sacrificed even on Friday night; whereas Jesus and His disciples would seem to have adopted the more rigorous view of the Pharisees, by which the paschal lamb ought to be sacrificed on the eve of the 14th of Nisan, when the 15th coincided with the Sabbath (see Bacher in *J.Q.R.*, 683-686).' This article is signed by Dr. Samuel Krauss, Buda-Pesth.

I see, on turning to the article 'Jesus Christ' in Hastings' *Dictionary of the Bible*, that Dr. Sanday notices this theory of Chwolson's, but thinks his argument seems strained. It is curious that it should have commended itself more successfully to a Jewish writer writing for Jews than to an eminent Christian divine. Various persons to whom I have mentioned it have been delighted with it, and have urged me to write to you about it. It comes with some force at the present time, when we have recently experienced our annual feast, Christmas, coming on the same day as our Christian Sabbath; and when doubtless there have been different opinions as to which of the two

ought to give way to the other, resulting probably in a corresponding variety of practice.

MARGARET D. GIBSON.

Cambridge.

The Hebrew Word for 'Stone.'

My note on the above (in the February number) has brought into the field two opponents, Dr. Langdon and Dr. Burney (see the April number), to whom I desire in the present paper to make a brief reply.

I. Although it is not absolutely necessary, it appears to me desirable to offer some preliminary observations on the points of view which are the only proper ones in an investigation like the present.—
(a) It may seem quite superfluous to remark that such an inquiry must start with an endeavour to apprehend what is the real point at issue. Yet I feel compelled to emphasize this in view of Dr. Langdon's statement (p. 321^a) that 'Professor König still adheres to the traditional derivation, and will admit no new light from Babylonia.' The point of view represented by the epithet 'traditional' has never played any part in my scientific studies. New light has always been welcomed by me, from whatever quarter it has come. It is only in the closing words of my article that I speak of 'new light,' and what I say there is given as the result of the examination of the problem which I have carried through. Although I am sure Dr. Langdon had no intention to do me an injustice, I should have been glad if he had left out the words I have quoted.—(b) An inquiry of this kind must be undertaken in *purely* philological interests. I make this remark because of the reference on p. 320^b to 'a period when Hebrew religion and culture began to be increasingly affected by Babylonia.' This is quite an illegitimate point of departure. For, in the first place, the inquiry thus ceases to be a purely philological one; and, secondly, it is questionable whether the passages referred to, with a few exceptions, belong to a period of increasing Babylonian influence. The boundaries of this period are very debatable. Thirdly, the influence of Babylonia upon Hebrew culture is *in general* open to much dispute. I should be glad of an opportunity of submitting to English readers my view of the extent of this influence, when I should certainly emphasize the

unquestionable differences between the Babylonian and the Hebrew culture.—(c) The primary object must be to establish the usage of the word in question in the literature to which it belongs, if one is to avoid missing the essential character of the linguistic expression which is the subject of inquiry.

II. Upon the above principles I sought in my article to determine, on purely philological grounds, the notion attached by the Hebrews to the verb *kipper*. I find no such procedure followed by either of my opponents. Neither of them takes the trouble to examine first of all and by itself the Hebrew usage in reference to the word. No real account is taken of any of the three groups of reasons from which I inferred that originally it was the idea of 'covering' that was present to the mind of the Hebrews who employed the word *kipper*. The third group, dealing with the manipulation of the sacrificial blood, is not considered. Hence I must regard my conclusions as unshaken, and, instead of retracting them, would only add that a much fuller enumeration of the passages in which *kipper* is used will be found in my *Wörterbuch*.¹ These it was unnecessary to cite in my article, whose only object was to establish the root idea of the Heb. word.

But I must now devote some special remarks to each of my two opponents, who severally seek to carry over a different meaning from the Bab. *kuppuru* to the Heb. *kipper*.

III. To begin with the contentions of Dr. Langdon.—(a) He says: 'In approaching the problem in Hebrew we must bear in mind that we are dealing with a language and with institutions closely allied with the N. Semitic group, especially with Babylonian' (p. 323^b). How little this has to do with a scientific investigation of the problem may be gathered from § II. of my previous article.—(b) In Gn 32²¹ it appears to him that *pānāv* means 'his wrath.' But since when and where did *pānīm* acquire the meaning of 'anger' or 'wrath'? The truth is, a sense of *pānīm* ('face') is here created *ad hoc*.—(c) Further, he regards it as 'more logical, before examining the Heb. cult term, to examine those passages in

which the word is not employed in the rituals' (*ibid.*). Why should this be more logical than the course adopted by me? The point is to note the indications from which it may be discovered what root idea the Hebrews attached to the verb *kipper*. And amongst these indications a first place belongs to the *construction* of this verb. Hence I have adduced examples of this, whether the relative passages belong to ritual texts or not. The scientific method is to advance from the *certain* significance of the Heb. verb to the *nuances* of meaning which, according to the generally recognized rules of semasiology, might be derived from it (see my *Wörterbuch*, s.v., on Pr 16¹⁴ etc., Is 47¹¹).—(d) In reference to Ex 30¹⁵, instead of noting what the Heb. *kipper* 'al naturally signifies, he has a cloud of words (p. 324^a) which quite obscure the obvious meaning of the expression, and adds: 'The idea of "covering" is never recognized in the Greek translations.' But was it to be *expected* that a Greek translator should reproduce the original sense of the Heb. verb? Dr. Langdon's remark contributes nothing to the solution of the problem.—(e) In 2 S 21³, he says (p. 324^b), there is the idea of 'removing guilt by a gift'; but, even if this were perfectly correct, the main question would still be, *How*, according to the Heb. conception, is this to be done? Was it an act of 'covering' or of 'wiping away' that was in the mind of the writer?—(f) Finally, he complains that to 'cover from sin' conveys no meaning (*ibid.*). But the expression 'cover from sin' occurs neither in Lv 15³⁰ nor 16¹⁶, the passages cited by him. In both, *min* signifies 'in consequence of.' I am therefore unable to admit that the idea of 'wipe away' lies at the root of the Heb. use of the verb *kipper*.

IV. Dr. Burney starts with the contention that the Bab. *kuppuru* originally bore the sense of 'whiten' or 'brighten.'—(a) The same meaning shows itself, he thinks, in the Heb. *képhōr*, 'hoarfrost.' This would certainly be probable if the Bab. *kapāru* had originally the sense of 'whiteness' or 'brightness.' But as yet this has not been proved, and hence there is meanwhile no ground for pronouncing against my explanation of *képhōr* (see p. 325^b, note).—(b) Dr. Burney seeks to show in a general way (p. 326^a) that the ultimate meaning of *kipper*—the securing that 'the offending person or object may in the future be favourably regarded by the offended person'—cannot have

¹ Ed. König, *Heb. und aram. Wörterbuch zum A. T., mit Einschaltung und Analyse aller schwer erkennbaren Formen, Deutung der Eigennamen sowie der massoret. Randbemerkungen, etc.* Leipzig: Dieterichsche Verlagsbuchhandlung, 1910, pp. 665. M. II.

been reached if the starting-point was the idea of 'covering.' For, if the covering is removed, the sin and the sinner stand once more revealed. But is it not self-evident that the covering contemplated is meant to be *permanent*?—(c) My contention that the meaning 'wipe' must be transformed into that of 'wipe away,' I withdraw in view of the assurance that the latter sense belongs to the Bab. term. But in the Heb. passages where *kipper* is construed with the accusative (see my *Wörterbuch*) it is impossible to attribute to it any other root-meaning than that which it bears when it is construed with '*al*' or '*bē'ad*', and before these prepositions *kipper* cannot possibly mean 'wipe away.'—

(d) Further, I give up my argument based upon the existence of the verb *māhā*, 'destroy.' It is evident also that in Gn 32²¹ the meaning 'brighten' or 'clear up' is quite appropriate; but one cannot separate this from other Hebrew passages.—(e) The meaning 'brightened through removal,' which Dr. Burney proposes for Pr 16¹⁴ and Is 47¹¹, is not a natural one. I prefer the sense 'mitigate' or 'render powerless,' which in my *Wörterbuch* is deduced, in accordance with recognized rules, from the root-meaning 'cover.'—(f) If it were proved, or capable of proof, that the root-meaning 'brighten' was before the mind's eye of the Hebrews, we should have to draw the violent conclusion that '*al*' and '*bē'ad*' when attached to *kipper* have lost their proper sense. But, seeing that in Hebrew *kipper* may quite as well have possessed the meaning 'cover,' such a transformation of the sense of '*al*' and '*bē'ad*' is quite unnecessary. Nor is the transformation required on account of the *lē* of Dt 21⁸, Ezk 16⁶³, Is 22¹⁴, Nu 35³³, for in the passages *kipper* has the derived sense of 'bestow pardon' (see my *Wörterbuch*). Finally, such a transformed sense of '*al*' is not necessary in the passages cited by Dr. Burney on p. 327^a, in which '*al*' with the person of the sinner and *min* with the sin or defilement appear side by side. In Lv 4²⁶ 5^{5b.10} 14¹⁹ 16³⁴, Nu 6¹¹ one may hesitate whether to attribute to *min* the sense of 'on account of' or 'away from' (= 'for the putting away of'). But this decides nothing, because we have now to add that—

V. In regard to the *derived* meanings of *kipper*, one can reach the same point from *either* point of departure. But this does not determine one's judgment as to the *root*-meaning which underlies the Heb. use of the term. The latter can be determined only by a study of the first and third

groups of reasons contained in my original article and my *Wörterbuch*. Only if the root-meaning is 'cover,' can the frequent construction of *kipper* with '*al*' and '*bē'ad*' be regarded as a *natural* one. It is quite *unnatural* if one sets out with the assumption that the primary sense is 'wipe away' or 'brighten.' As a matter of fact, the Heb. usage of the word *kipper* is the *only* starting-point from which to determine the original signification of the word. The appeal to other Semitic languages is precarious, as was shown in § II. of my first article, and as has been once more set forth in § I. (b) of the present paper.

ED. KÖNIG.

Bonn.

Supplementary Note on the Hebrew Word for 'Atone.'

In the last number of the *Revue d'Assyriologie*, which appeared in March, and consequently too late for me to use in my article in the April number of THE EXPOSITORY TIMES, le Père Dhorme has published a very important religious text. The learned Dominican has edited the text admirably, but the fact has escaped him that he really has found a fragment of the ritual for the fourth and fifth days of the Babylonian New Year's festival. I have already translated the previously known texts, giving the ritual for the second, third, and fourth days in *The Expositor*, 1909, 153 ff. Dhorme's text contains a nearly complete account of the ritual for the fifth day, when the Holy of holies or Ezida chapel of Nebo in the great temple of Marduk was consecrated. We have here a ritual closely parallel to the yearly consecration of the Holy of holies in the Hebrew ritual. I translate here this remarkable passage.

'When the purification of the temple shall have been finished unto the shrine¹ of Nebo he shall enter, with the incense stand, the torch and bowl of sacred water he shall purify the house. He shall sprinkle the interior of the shrine with water of a well of the Tigris and of a well of the Euphrates. He shall touch all the doors of the shrine with cedar oil, and place the incense stand of silver² in a niche of the shrine. Upon it he shall

¹ *papāhu*.

² The *niknakku* is a stand containing a bowl at the top, and has been identified by me on a fragment of a sculptured memorial deed (P.S.B.A., 1909, 75 ff.).

mix incense and cypress. A peasant he shall command to sever the head of a male sheep, and with the body of the sheep the priest of incantation shall purge the house.¹ He shall recite the oaths for incanting a house. He shall purify the shrine in its whole extent and put out the censer. The body of this sheep the priest of incantation shall carry away. Toward the river Nala westward² he shall turn his face. He shall throw this sheep into the river, and go out into the field. The peasant shall do the same with the head of the sheep. Both the priest of incantation and the peasant shall go out into the field. They shall not enter into anything belonging to Nebo lord of Babylon.

¹ *ukappar*.

² The descent to Hades was supposed to be in the far west, and the demons of evil, driven back to Hades by incantations, hence descended from the world in the regions of the west.

From the fifth day to the twelfth day they shall abide in the field. The high priest shall not see the purification of the house. If he behold it he is not clean.³

We have here a clear case of the 'scape goat' employed in a magical ritual. The verb *ukappar*, which I have shown to mean 'remove the cult objects which have absorbed uncleanness,' here comes to mean 'purge, purify,' a natural stage of development, but the process of purification is evident in this passage, and confirms the theory set forth in the previous article. The root meaning of *kapāru* is, therefore, 'remove,' not 'cover.' Note also in this passage that the priest and peasant are unclean for seven days, an idea recurring in the Hebrew ritual.

S. H. LANGDON.

Oxford.

³ *Revue d'Assyriologie*, viii. 48, rev. i. 2-22.

The Wise Man.

BY THE REV. D. RUSSELL SCOTT, M.A., MONTROSE.

SOMETIMES in the later history there arose in Israel a distinct type of character called 'the wise man,' a type that became a guild or a school also with the name of 'the wise men' (Jer 18¹⁵). These wise men in Israel had one or two broad characteristics which marked them off both from priests and prophets. With the ritual of religion they had no concern; nor had they any interest in the distinctly national ideals of the prophets. They were cosmopolitan. They assumed broadly the prophetic teaching as to God and Duty. They looked at life and interpreted life from the human point of view, and have been aptly called 'the humanists of Israel.' As their name suggests, wisdom was their theme, their subject, and their Muse. And they conceived Wisdom in the broadest way. She was to the wise men no particular kind of skill, draughtsmanship, or ingenuity, nor was she 'the slow, prudent thrift of life,' but she is the whole art and science of life itself, the whole spirit that guides life to its best, richest, and happiest issues. 'Wisdom is the principal thing.' Wisdom is Life (Pr 8³⁵). As wisdom is the very condition of all peace, happiness, and

success in life, we need not be surprised that the wise men urge that with all our getting we get wisdom.

Their urgency was doubtless a necessity. There was foolish youth and stupid age in Israel, men and women who had not learnt, perhaps would not learn, the art of true living. To such the wise men urged the claims of wisdom; to such they made her beautiful and attractive so that she might be desired. The wise men had their audience. But though the world is more than two thousand years older and has grown in experience, there appears still the same necessity to say within our own hearts and to cry upon the streets, 'Wisdom is the principal thing, therefore with all thy getting, get wisdom.' Oh man, become wise: learn the art of life. We see men with all the means of happiness, yet without its real power; others with every opportunity of usefulness, but their usefulness is marred by some slight defect in tact or temper, which they have neither eyes to see nor wisdom to remove. We see youth losing its opportunity, blundering over its decisions in sheer stupidity of heart. We see men (and

women too) taking offence over an imaginary slight, and letting it breed bitterness and misery in their hearts, taking foolish heed to what should be wisely left alone ; or others uttering hard, cruel, irresponsible speech, apparently ignorant that the rebound upon themselves will be far more injurious than the blow itself. Stupidities, vanities, follies still exist—a great multitude. It is blindness, not charity, that does not see them. The cry is still necessary, ‘Get wisdom !’ We can see the necessity, too, when we remember how manifold, how complex is the whole duty of life. Mr. A. C. Benson, in one of his essays, says that ‘nothing taxes a man so heavily as the task of maintaining smooth, pleasant, and charitable relations with one’s fellows.’ It is a tax which has to be paid by us all, and needs wisdom for its proper discharge. Epictetus said that there is for every man one great classification of the universe, into the things which concern him and the things which do not concern him. And no doubt success in life depends on differentiating the things which concern us from those which do not—in being concerned only with our own concerns. But such differentiation makes a great and continual demand upon wisdom ; without wisdom it is impossible. And, to take another of the common difficulties of life, how many find to make a proper and proportionate disposition of the twelve hours of the day no easy task ? They have abundance of working power and abundance of opportunity, but just through the lack of a proper and proportionate disposition of their time, they find themselves doing far too much of one thing and neglecting another altogether, to the manifest hurt of the symmetry and easy working of life. There are but twelve hours in the day, but to place them well is a tax upon wisdom. Truly life needs wisdom, therefore with all thy getting, get wisdom.

But what is this wisdom, this principal thing that is the science and art of life ? The fear of the Lord, says the wise man, is the beginning, the chief thing, the true substance of wisdom. But that answer only starts another question, What is the fear of the Lord ? The fear of the Lord, says the wise man, is to hate evil (Pr 8¹⁸) ; its opposite is wisdom in one’s own eyes (Pr 3⁷), that is, it is the moral opposite of a proud, confident, intellectual superiority, it is a true humility and a willingness to learn ; further, according to a psalmist

(Ps 5⁷), the fear of the Lord is the true spirit of worship. Blend these three, a hate of evil (which of course carries its positive—a love of the good), a true humility, and a worshipful reverence, and you have the fear of the Lord, the principal thing in wisdom. So the wise man comes simply to be the man of goodness, humility, and reverence—the man of character and religion. The question then naturally arises whether this man is wise in an actual, practical, and, using the word in the best sense, utilitarian way, whether he is a good artist working in the stuff of life, whether he is one who, in the utilitarian phrase, will make the best or most of life. The wise men answered this question in the affirmative. Wisdom meant to them happiness, length of days, prosperity, completeness of life (Pr 8³⁵ *et passim*). And no doubt their answer was based upon experience and a careful induction. But without attempting to defend or criticise or even blame their answer, we can see this far, that most of our mistakes in life, the mistakes that wrong our own soul, would never occur but for lack of a little of Israel’s wisdom. For instance, take the mistake of being concerned with the things that do not concern us—is it not, with every one of its disastrous consequences, just due to our being wise in our own eyes, to our thinking we know everything and can do everything ? The Rev. Edward Casaubon of Middlemarch fame was greatly concerned with details of mythology of little concern to him or any one else ; but the seed of his great useless concern was just a great conceit. He was wise in his own eyes and a fool. Or, if we look at the question not from the point of view of mistake, but of success, we find that the people who are wise enough to gather peace and general satisfaction out of life are not for the most part of great intellect, or striking capacity, or outstanding force, but are of humble heart, grateful spirit, and reverent will. The real expert in life, the true artist in living, the genuinely wise, is the man of virtue and fear of the Lord. The whole appearance of the world and its civilization has changed from what it was two thousand or more years ago, but wisdom is now just what it was then. Men may progress, but man and his wisdom remain the same.

But how is the true wisdom of life to come to us ? Experience seems to be the natural avenue, but, as Coleridge says, ‘Experience is too often

like the stern lights of a ship, it illuminates only the path over which we have travelled, and it gives no enlightenment or guidance for conduct in the future.' We say, 'Experience teaches fools'; but it teaches them too late, when the teaching is of no value. It is not at the end of life, nor even in the middle, when wisdom is the most desirable thing, but in youth (see Prov. *passim*). And wisdom is there at the beginning, present and accessible to youth. 'Those that seek her early shall find her.' She is not only present and accessible—she is

urgent with her claims. She cries out on the street, asking acceptance. The wisdom of God stands at the door and knocks. The Spirit of God seeks an entrance. 'If any of you lack wisdom, let him ask,' and go on asking, for the hour to receive her is never too late, and never too early. Wisdom is eternally present. She comes down from above, and is as keen to enter the heart as the heart is to receive her. The wisdom of God, which is the wisdom of man, besets our very life.

Entre Nous.

The Mount of Vision.

Miss Adeline Cashmore has selected and arranged a Book of English Mystic Verse, and it has been published by Messrs. Chapman & Hall under the title of *The Mount of Vision*. What is mystic verse? Well, it is simply religious. So says Alice Meynell quite frankly in the pleasant Introduction which she writes for the volume. The value of the book, therefore, depends on the genius of the editor. And the mark is visible. But for us it is easier to judge by example than by precept. So here is one of the lyrics: it deserves quotation because of the Introduction to the book.

I AM THE WAY.

Thou art the way.

Hadst Thou been nothing but the goal,

I cannot say

If Thou hadst ever met my soul.

I cannot see—

I, child of process—if there lies

An end for me,

Full of repose, full of replies.

I'll not reproach

The way that goes, my feet that stir.

Access, approach,

Art Thou, time, way and wayfarer.

ALICE MEYNELL.

Across the Years.

This is another volume of poetry—lyrics and sonnets chiefly. They are not a selection from

other poets' work, they are all the work of Fanny Elizabeth Sidebottom. The title is *Across the Years* (Madgwick; 1s. 6d. net). Often there is the echo of some older poet, as in this song of sorrow.

A SONG OF SORROW.

We do not sing because our hearts are glad,

But when the strain

Of bitter pain

Becomes so great that we should else go mad!
And then we tell the world that we are sad.

Joy cannot reach man's deepest self-like woe.

Our happiness

Would scarcely bless

The sad heart of humanity to know;—

Our song of sorrow sanctifies some blow.

And thus our sharp distress hath work to do,

And its wild cry

Will never die—

Wrung from our tortured lives it echoes true,

And when God hears He pities us anew.

Dulce Domum.

Dr. George Moberly, who was headmaster of Winchester College from 1835 to 1866, and Bishop of Salisbury from 1869 to 1885, has had his home life described by his daughter. The volume is called *Dulce Domum* (Murray; 1os. 6d. net). Is there any other country in the world where such a home could be found, where such a book could be written? It is not at all the gush of family

worship we might have had in some languages. There is freedom, criticism, head enough as well as warm heart. And there were neighbours in Keble and Miss Yonge.

Bishop Moberly was a great man, and knew it not. When he died, Dean Church sent this letter:

'MY DEAR GEORGE,—Thank you for writing to me. Yes, the shock is greater than I expected, now it is come. He has been so long a part, and a large part, of my world that the world seems different without him. No one knows, no one knew, not even he, how much all that I am, and can do, and can hope for, I owe to him. You know something; but he was the person who opened my dull eyes, and put a high reality of character and purpose before them, and made me feel the difference between narrowness and manliness, between the mere shell and letter of religion and its living truth.'

'You will give my love, and all our loves, to your mother. Of course I hope to be at Salisbury on Friday.'

There are diaries and letters, with much in them or with little. The little is often greater than the much. There is this in a letter from Bishop Moberly to Bishop Patteson: 'And now our minds are all full of the loss we have recently sustained by the death of dear Mr. Keble. . . . Mrs. Keble, for many weeks, has seemed to be at the point of death. He was reading prayers by her bedside when he grew faint. . . . From that time his strength gradually failed, and in a week he quietly sank. His wandering words were, of course, wild and inconsecutive; but "the upper room" and "full of lilies" were the most intelligible expressions of his last hours.'

The world was a small one certainly. But what is small, and what is great? There was progress, for was it not resented? Thus: 'Many changes have been taking place here. The glee club now comes into chapel in surplices; it produces a splendid body of sound, and the hymns are grand. My father chanted this evening, and as it was the first time his voice had been heard anywhere this half-year, all the boys looked up with interest. Another change is that, instead of calling names at the end of the service, the prefects go down the rows marking off those boys who are absent. It only takes two minutes, and is much more orderly, but being a change we think it proper to resent it.'

The Great Text Commentary.

The best illustrations this month have been found by the Rev. S. J. Martin, Laura, S. Australia, and by the Rev. B. F. Relton, Chelsea.

Illustrations for the Great Text for June must be received by the 1st of May. The text is Ps 51¹⁷.

The Great Text for July is Ps 68¹⁸:

'Thou hast ascended on high, thou hast led thy captivity captive;
Thou hast received gifts among men,
Yea, among the rebellious also, that the Lord
God might dwell with them.'

A copy of any volume of the 'Great Texts of the Bible,' or of the 'International Theological Library,' will be given for the best illustration.

The Great Text for August is Ps 90¹²:

'So teach us to number our days,
That we may get us an heart of wisdom.'

A copy of any volume of the 'Great Texts of the Bible,' or of the 'Scholar as Preacher' series, will be given for the best illustration.

The Great Text for September is Ps 103^{1. 2}:

'Bless the Lord, O my soul;
And all that is within me, bless his
holy name.'

A copy of any volume of the 'Great Texts of the Bible,' or of Scott's *The Kingdom and the Messiah*, will be given for the best illustration.

The Great Text for October is Ps 118²⁴:

'This is the day which the Lord hath made;
We will rejoice and be glad in it.'

A copy of Emmet's *The Eschatological Question in the Gospels*, or of Scott's *The Kingdom and the Messiah*, or of any volume of the 'Scholar as Preacher' series, will be given for the best illustration.

Those who send illustrations should at the same time name the books they wish sent them if successful. Illustrations to be sent to the Editor, St. Cyrus, Montrose, Scotland.



אנדרה רפניא מפנ
גבינה
ואנדר
הראה אל מינון הפתה
הרע עלבלי שמי נז
הארון כירגנין סרא
לב כל שפהות ממלכת
געפוע נאם ייחודה וכiao
נתנו איש סכא פתח
שערי ירושים ועילן
ומתיה סכנו שבל עלי
הראה וברתת משפטיהם
ליברעותם אשר עבננ
קיטרול אלהים אחרים
שתחו למשיעו וירזה
ואתת תאוור מהנץ
וקמיה רוכבה אלרט
אתכל אשר אנכ מיט
בעז אלתת נפניהם
שהחרת לפניהם ואן
הנחתת נגידים לעיל
כחצץ ולעפירות ברול
להומת מושת עיל
הארון ליריכ יורה
שריה לכתה ולבם
הארץ נלהקמי אליז
דרלאו כוינר כיאת
אנ נאם יהה להעין
ויררכריו
אליל ראמיר הלוור זי
קראט לאוניזו שלם
אנרכיה אמר יהו
ברתת לו הרס געריה
אתה כלורטן יקלה
אתה באארץ לאוועזע

ער גליות ירושלים כח' רוח
ההנישו וו' וו'
רכיריה אל לאמיר
בטראם איזיך בעט' י' ז' עלה ונטראת העז
מזרחן איזושטער נכא
לאיס נטהו' ואמיר
אהה ארנייהה הנע
לאירעטער ב' נער
אנכ' וו' ואמר
הזרה אל לאמיר
גער אנט' ב' עלב' אט
אשר אשלחה רתל' ז'
אטפלאשו אציך ז'
עטבר איזטראט' נט' ז'
כ' אטדר אב' רח' נבר
אכ' יורה וו' ישיח' נו' ז'
את' יורה גער פ' איז
חויה אל הנט' נט' ז'
בק' ראה הפק' ז'
תויים וו' עיל' האיס
על' חמ' מ' כ' ל' נט' ז'
ל' נט' ז' וו' האיכ' ז'
ויה' ה' ל' נט' ז' וו' ז'
ויה' ר' כ' ז'
חויה אל לאמיר מ' ז'
את' ה' וו' וו' ז'
ז' אמ' מ' ק' ש' ז' א' ז'
ד' א' וו' אמ' ר' ה' א' ז'
ה' י' ה' כ' ל' ז'
אנ' ע' ר' ב' ר' ל' ע' ש' ז'
ויה' ר' כ' י' ז'
ש' נ' ל' א' מ' מ' א' מ'
רא' א' נ' ג' נ' פ' ז'

הרשות בעשרות שוטריה
להרש נושא אירל ני
מיורו מלר בבלשננה
בלרלי אורה אשיזרין
בלרלי יוזה מבית ברא
יררכר אטו טברוןינו
אתכסאומלע בכא
המלכים אשר ארכו
בלילו ושגע אטכדר
בריאו ואיל להסתניד
לפינבל נייחו ווא
ארהטו ארחת תפמיד
תענולמאת תפילר
ברירוכ כימומל בוי

טס גְּסֹקָן סְפִּירָה נְגִיבָּס אַלְגָּה
וְבְּשָׁעָרָנִיאָת וְשְׁלִמְיוּם וְמַנְגָּן

תְּבִרְיָה